

*The gift of the author to J.
Brand, July 28th 1795.
Somerset Place, Lond
3165. d. 41.*

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

THIRD, FOURTH AND FIFTH CHAPTERS

OF THE

BOOK of GENESIS.

THE GIFT OF THE AUTHOR
TO THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY
OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK
ON THE
THIRD, FOURTH AND FIFTH CHARTERS
OF THE
BOOK OF GENESIS

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

THIRD, FOURTH AND FIFTH CHAPTERS

OF THE

Bible Genesis

Book of GENESIS.

BY

T. W. WRIGHT, A. M. CLERK.

“ What mean ye that ye use this Proverb, *** saying,
“ The Fathers have eaten four Grapes, and the
“ Children’s Teeth are set on edge ?”

EZEK. xviii. 2.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED FOR R. BLAMIRE, STRAND; J. WALTERS, CHARING CROSS; C. DILLY, IN THE
POULTRY; AND J. SMEETON, No. 148, ST. MARTIN’S LANE, CHARING CROSS.

M D C C L X X I X.

P R E F A C E.

WHEN the necessity of a new translation of the Bible, was first suggested to King James; it was observed, that “if every man’s
“humour might be followed, there
“would be no end of translating.” But his Majesty well knew, that the various sentiments and opinions of mankind, at least of those who had made the scriptures their study, might be made subservient to the compilation of a more correct and uniform translation.

Where-

Wherefore when a new translation was determined upon, he gave it in charge, to those who were appointed to superintend and conduct the undertaking, to cause “ Letters to be
 “ sent from every bishop, to the rest
 “ of his clergy, admonishing them
 “ of this translation in hand; and
 “ to move, and charge as many as,
 “ being skilful in the tongues, *have*
 “ *taken pains in that kind*, to send
 “ his particular observations to the
 “ company, either at *Westminster*,
 “ *Cambridge, or Oxford.*” (*Fuller’s*
Ch. Hist. book x. p. 47.)

When therefore I ventured to suggest, upon a former occasion, the advantages which might reasonably be
 expected

expected to result, from an accurate, and as far as might be, a literal translation of the septuagint; and the satisfaction it would give, “ were it
 “ to be carried on under the *inspec-*
 “ *tion and control* of those persons,
 “ who alone are properly qualified,
 “ to superintend and conduct the
 “ undertaking;” I did not mean that “ the rest of the clergy,” should renounce the liberty of private judgment, but that the “ particular
 “ observations,” of those who had made the scriptures their study, should be submitted with becoming modesty to the superior judgment of their more learned brethren.

“ I wish,” said King James, (and so do many now say,) “ some special
 “ pains

“ pains were taken for an uniform
“ translation; *which should be done*
“ *by the best learned in both universities,*
“ *then reviewed by the bishops, pre-*
“ *sented to the Privy Council, lastly*
“ *ratified by Royal Authority, to be*
“ *read in the whole church.*” (Fuller’s
Ch. Hist. b. x. p. 14.)

And to the accomplishment of so
desirable an undertaking, the less
learned may contribute, by a free
communication of their particular
observations.

It was perhaps, presumptuous in
me to affirm, that there was now
very little prospect of obtaining an
accurate translation of the Hebrew
Bible ;

X
11 16

Bible; but ignorance is always prone to slight that knowledge which it does not possess. Nevertheless how necessary the Greek version of the septuagint is, to the right understanding of the Hebrew text, the reader may judge from this single instance.

The learned editor of the two epistles of St. Clement to the Corinthians, (*Hen. Wotton, Coll. Sti Job. Evan. A. M. &c. Cant. 1718.*) has subjoined the following note, upon a passage which St. Clement transcribed from the septuagint.

“ Οὐκ ἔαν ὁρθῶς προσενέγκης, ὁρθῶς δὲ μὴ δέλης,
 “ ἡμαρτες; ἡσύχασον] Hæc quidem ex
 b “ LXX

x
11 1/6

“ LXX c̄itari, neque facile adeo
 “ cum Hebræo textu, prout in præ-
 “ sens habetur, videntur posse con-
 “ ciliari; rejectis tamen punctis,
 “ quod absque piaculo, utpote a
 “ Masorethis adjectis, cuivis est inte-
 “ grum, literæ Hebraicæ ad amissim
 “ cum lectione τῶν ο conveniunt,
 “ ***** annon si benefeceris offerre,
 “ vel offerendo, & si non benefeceris
 “ dividendo, peccasti? cesses, quies-
 “ cas, vel accumbas. Onkelosi Tar-
 “ gum [Hierosol. etiam et Ben.
 “ Uziel] ad hodiernam punctua-
 “ tionem per periphrasin explicat,
 “ ***** annon si benefeceris opus
 “ tuum remittetur vel relinquetur
 “ i. e. reponetur tibi; et si non be-
 “ nefeceris opus tuum in diem judicii
 “ peccatum

“ peccatum tuum asservatur? versi-
 “ ones Vulgat. Syr. & Arab. punctu-
 “ ationem Masorethicam sequuntur.
 “ Ego sane, refragantibus licet cæteris
 “ versionibus et antiquissima para-
 “ phrasi nec non recentioribus, lec-
 “ tionem τῶν ο præferendam esse cen-
 “ seo: vulgo enim recepte interpre-
 “ tatio, neque cum præcedentibus
 “ verbis, in quibus de sacrificio agi-
 “ tur, neque cum Hebraico textu
 “ rectius punctuato adeo apte con-
 “ venit: nihil enim de sacrificio
 “ habetur, qua mente, quave inten-
 “ tione fit offerendum, vel ex qua
 “ parte Cain in sacrificando peccavit
 “ contra deum; adeo ut Deo potius
 “ fit acceptum fratris, quam illius
 “ sacrificium; cum, si attendamus

“ ad contextum, hoc foret præcipue
 “ agendum, quæ quidem omnia ver-
 “ fio τῶν ο exhibet, sicut a Tertulliano
 “ in Libro contra Judæos explicatur:
 “ *accepto ferens, quæ offerebat in sim-*
 “ *plicitate cordis, et reprobens sacrifi-*
 “ *cium fratris ejus Cain, qui, quod*
 “ *offerabat, non recte dividebat.*” &c.

It would be trifling to apologize
 for the imperfections of a former
 publication: but with respect to the
 supposed interpolations and mistakes
 of the Greek version; I think it
 would be expedient for every trans-
 lator, to take it for granted that his
 text was pure and faultless. For
 otherwise, whenever a difficulty oc-
 curs, he will be too apt to have re-
 course

course to other versions, and to adopt that reading which admits of the most obvious interpretation. And hence it will be, that the oldest and most authentic copies, will be corrected by the less authentic and modern, for this obvious reason, that in general, they will be found the plainest; the crooked paths having been made strait, and the rough ways smooth.

Thus *Gen.* v. 26. M. Le Clerk takes upon him to correct the Alexandrian copy by that of Aquila, for no other reason, that I know of, but because it was the most intelligible : or agreed best with the most approved interpretation of a doubtful passage.

I do

I do not mean to assert that different readings ought not to be consulted; far from it; a collation of MSS. is a work greatly to be desired, but what I mean to assert is, that the correction of the text, ought not to be the *first* work of a translator.

I have only to remark, by way of Preface to the following pages, that we are very apt to use as it were, this proverb, *concerning our first parents*, “saying, the fathers have eaten four
“grapes, and the children’s teeth
“are set on edge.” But it is written, thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people; neither does it become us, lightly to speak evil of those illustrious personages, of
whose

whose blood God was pleased to form all nations of the world. Let us rather own with gratitude, that not as the offence so also was the free gift; and let this be our consolation, that as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

St. Martin in the Fields, Westminster,
Nov. 2d, 1789.

OBSERVATIONS
ON THE
THIRD, FOURTH, and FIFTH CHAPTERS
OF THE
BOOK OF GENESIS.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

IN the second chapter of the book of Genesis, we are told that,
“ God planted a garden in Edem toward the sun-rising, and placed there the man whom he formed. And now, God caused to spring up out of the ground, every tree that was beautiful to the sight; and good for food, and a tree of life; throughout the garden: and a tree to discern the knowledge of good and evil. — And the Lord God took the man whom he formed; and placed him in the garden, to cultivate and preserve it. And the Lord
B “ God

“ God commanded Adam, saying—Of every
 “ tree of the garden thou mayest eat food, but
 “ of the tree to discern the knowledge of good
 “ and evil, eat ye not of that, but in the day
 “ ye do eat thereof, ye will perish by
 “ death.—

“ And the Lord God said.—It is not good,
 “ that man should be *alone*.—Let us make him
 “ an assistant like himself.”—Adam therefore
 was *alone*, when God told him, that they were
 not to eat of the tree to discern the knowledge
 of good and evil ; but that if they did eat there-
 of, they (that is, both Adam, and the woman,
 whom God formed out of the ground, and was
 now about to join with him, Gen. ii. 21.)
 would perish by death. Consequently, *the pur-
 port of the revelation, was impressed only upon
 the mind of Adam.*

It is also probable, that the will of God was
 made known unto him in a dream : for it is
 written, “ If there is a prophet among
 “ you, I the Lord will make myself known
 unto him in a *vision*, and will *speak unto him in
 a dream.*” Numb. xii. 6.—And accordingly, we
 find that “ God cast a deep sleep upon Adam,”
 and that he slept, during the figurative repre-
 sentation of the formation of the woman. That
 the

the will of God was not impressed upon the mind of Eve, *by the influence of the prophetic spirit*, appears still more probable, from a subsequent passage, wherein Adam is *individually* taxed, with having eaten of the tree, whereof God had commanded him not to eat. Gen. iii. 11.—and again v. 17. “ Because thou
 “ hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife, (in opposition to the purport of the prophetic vision,) “ and hast eaten of the tree, of which I
 “ commanded thee saying, thou shalt not eat
 “ of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake,
 “ &c.”

Eve, no doubt, would soon be made acquainted with the purport of the revelation, whereby they were directed to abstain from “ the tree to
 “ discern the knowledge of good and evil:” but as the tree was beautiful to the sight, and the fruit thereof apparently good for food, she seems to have been led thereby to conclude, that the admonitions of her husband, (which derived all their force from the declared purport of the prophetic vision) proceeded from too lively a sense of danger; and the apprehension of an event which was not likely to befall them. And therefore, without ascribing to the woman that baseness of heart, which more or less ac-

companies the wilful violation of social duties ; we may attribute her transgression to no worse a cause than *the want of that laudable submission of her desires to the superior judgment of her husband*, which, she had yet to learn, would be conducive to her real happiness.

For this cause St. Paul appeals to the writings of Moses, in order to evince the propriety of his admonitions to Timothy, touching the line of conduct which it would be proper for his female converts to pursue.—“ Let the woman learn in silence, with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence ; for Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.” 1 *Tim.* ii. 11—14.

A more pertinent argument the apostle could not have used ; upon supposition that the deception of the woman, was first owing to the want of that modest deference of opinion, and silent subjection which he so forcibly recommends ; and this in all probability was the case ; so that, *the mind of the woman was not first vitiated by the influence of a delusive vision ; but the vision*
itself

itself was founded upon the previous suggestions of her own mind.

Of the supposed agency of Satan.

“ BUT the serpent was the most subtle of
 “ all the beasts upon the earth, which the
 “ Lord God made.”

The serpent was of all other creatures the most subtle, (or, in other words, afforded the most lively and familiar emblem of subtilty and deceit), and was therefore selected, by the wise contriver of man's redemption, to be the visionary medium of imparting delusive council to the mind of Eve.

“ And the serpent said unto the woman :—
 “ Wherefore said God, eat ye not of every tree
 “ of the garden?—And the woman said, we
 “ may eat of the fruit of the garden, but of the
 “ tree which is in the midst of the garden,
 “ God said, eat you not of that, neither touch
 “ it lest ye die.—And the serpent said unto
 “ the woman ;—Ye will not perish by death ;
 “ for God doth know, that in the day ye do
 “ eat

“ eat thereof, your eyes will be opened, and ye
 “ will be as Gods, knowing good and evil.”

Satan is supposed to have been *the principal* agent in this business, and either to have assumed the form of a serpent, or to have made use of the creature as an instrument in the intended fraud: but the scriptures are every where very express in excluding the supposed agency of a powerful and vindictive spirit; or rather, in teaching us this fundamental truth, that there is no power but of God.

Thus we read in the book of Deuteronomy;
 “ If there arise among you a prophet, or a
 “ dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or
 “ wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to
 “ pass whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let
 “ us go after other Gods, which thou hast not
 “ known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not
 “ hearken unto the words of that prophet, or
 “ that dreamer of dreams: for *the Lord your*
 “ *God proveth you*, to know whether ye love
 “ the Lord your God with all your heart, and
 “ and with all your soul,” &c. (*Deut. xii. 1—3.*)
 —And in the book of the prophet Ezekiel, “ If
 “ the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken
 “ a thing, *I the Lord have deceived that pro-*
 “ *phet*, and I will stretch out my hand upon
 “ him

“ him, and will destroy him from the midst of
 “ my people Israel.” (*Ezek. xiv. 9, 10.*)

A remarkable instance of this occurs in the case of Ahab; before whom Micaiah the prophet thus expounds the purport of his vision.

“ And he said, Hear thou therefore the word
 “ of the Lord,—I saw the Lord sitting on his
 “ throne, and all the host of heaven standing
 “ by him, on his right hand and on his left :
 “ and the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab,
 “ that he may go up and fall at Ramoth Gi-
 “ lead?—And one said on this manner, and
 “ another said on that manner. And there
 “ came forth a spirit, and stood before the
 “ Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And
 “ the Lord said unto him wherewith?—And
 “ he said, I will go forth, and will be a lying
 “ spirit in the mouth of all his prophets.
 “ And he said, Thou shalt persuade him and
 “ prevail also : go forth, and do so.—Now
 “ therefore, behold *the Lord hath put a lying*
 “ *spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets,*
 “ and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning
 “ thee.” (*1 Kings xxii. 19—23.*)

A still more remarkable instance occurs in the case of Pharaoh :—for when Aaron cast down his rod, and it became a serpent :

“ Then

“ Then Pharaoh also called the *Wise-men*
 “ and *Sorcerers* :—now *the Magicians of Egypt*,
 “ they also did in like manner with their enchant-
 “ ments : for they cast down every man his rod,
 “ and they became serpents : but Aaron’s rod
 “ swallowed up their rods. And he hardened
 “ Pharaoh’s heart, that he hearkened not unto
 “ them ; as the Lord had said.” (*Exod.*
 “ vii. 8—13.

Thus it pleased God to make the *Magicians*
 of Egypt, (as in the case of Ahab’s four hun-
 dred prophets,) subservient to the delusion of
 the monarch ; and it appears from the cir-
 cumstances of the story that God hardened
 Pharaoh’s heart, by giving real efficacy, to the
 vain attempts of the *Magicians*. For notwith-
 standing it is true that the rods which the
Magicians cast down were converted into ser-
 pents ; yet the circumstance of Aaron’s rod
 swallowing up their rods, sufficiently points out
 the source of that power by which the miracle
 was wrought. Pharaoh’s heart was hardened,
 because he vainly supposed that the *Wise-men*
 and *Sorcerers*, were able by the “ illusions of
 “ their magical arts,” (*Wisd.* xvii. 7.) “ to
 “ deck themselves with majesty and power,”
 (*Job*

(*Job*. xl. 10.) and to work signs and wonders, as the ministers of the gods they worshipped.

“ The grand principle which runs through
 “ the whole Jewish dispensation, is, that Je-
 “ hovah is the one true God, that he is sole
 “ creator and sovereign of the world, which
 “ he governs by fixed and invariable laws, and
 “ that no superior beings whatever, besides
 “ God, are able to controul those laws, or
 “ that course and order of events, which he
 “ established. Accordingly, the old testament re-
 “ fers to the immediate and miraculous agency
 “ of God alone, all those effects which are
 “ contrary to that order.—The christian dis-
 “ pensation proceeds upon the same principle;
 “ and farther teaches, that as there is but one
 “ God so there is but one mediator between
 “ God and man, to whom any power or
 “ authority over mankind is delegated, and
 “ who, indeed, hath all power, both in heaven
 “ and earth, given unto him. Now, if there be
 “ no sovereign of nature but God, and no
 “ mediator between God and man but Christ;
 “ there can be no other superior intelligences,
 “ who have any power over the laws of nature,
 “ or over the human system in particular.
 “ Indeed, there could be no law of nature, no

“ fixed constitution of things, either respecting
 “ the world in general, or the human system
 “ in particular, if the order of that constitution
 “ might be disturbed at the pleasure of malignant spirits.” (*Farmer’s essay on the Demoniacs.* p. 183.)

We have examined the old Testament, let us now see whether “ the “ Christian “ dispensation does not proceed upon the same principle.” Our Saviour is supposed to have alluded to the false suggestions whereby Satan, (the old serpent) deceived Eve, when he told the Jews, who sought to kill him, that they were of their father the devil, and that the lusts of their father they would do. (John viii. 44.) But, surely, it was the prevarication of Cain; and the temper and disposition of him who slew his brother, “ because “ his own works were evil and his brother’s “ righteous, (1. *John* iii. 12. 15.) which our Saviour meant to compare with that of the Pharisees, who from similar motives sought to kill him. He very justly observes that their murderous designs against him, sufficiently proved that they were not the children of faithful Abraham, but rather the descendants of Cain who was “ a murderer from the beginning, “ and abode not in the truth because there was
 “ no

“ no truth in him.” (Compare Gen. iv. 8, 9. with John viii. 44.)

In the estimation of St. Paul, an *Idol* and a *Devil* are one and the same thing: and the Gentiles who sacrificed to idols, are elsewhere said to have sacrificed to devils; and as we know that an “ Idol is nothing in the world,” so the devil, or Satan is a term made use of to signify that imaginary being, whose throne is established in the unruly wills and affections of sinful men. (Compare 1 Cor. viii. 4—7.—1 Cor. x. 19, 20.—1 Tim. iv. 1. with Rev. ix. 20, 21. and various other passages of Scripture.)

Saint Peter sufficiently explains what he meant by the “ *angels which sinned,*” (2 Pet. ii. 4.) in the verse following, wherein he gives us to understand that they were of “ the old world,” and that “ Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of “ righteousness,” was saved from among them; *when God brought in the flood upon the world of the ungodly.*”

St. Jude describes them, in like manner, “ as reserved in everlasting chains under darkness; unto the judgment of the great day,” &c. (Jude 6, 7.)—“ *When God will render unto every man according to his work.*”—

In the book of Psalms, the angels are called

“ the ministers of God, *who do his pleasure.*”
 (*Psalms* ciii. 21.) We are taught to pray that
 God’s will may “ be done on earth, as it is in
 “ heaven;” (*Matt.* vi. 10.) without any refe-
 rence to the supposed apostacy of Satan and his
 angels; and our Saviour tells us that “ they
 “ which shall be accounted worthy to obtain
 “ that world, and the resurrection from the
 “ dead, neither marry nor are given in marri-
 “ age: neither can they die any more: *for they*
 “ *are equal unto the angels*; and are the children
 “ of God, being the children of the resurrection.”
 —(*Luke* xx. 35, 36.)

It is therefore, no less repugnant to the lan-
 guage of scripture, to call *Satan* an *apostate an-
 gel*; than it is to represent him under that cha-
 racter, as possessed of power, sufficient to disturb
 the settled course of God’s providence here on
 earth. And consequently we may venture to
 conclude, that he could neither “ *assume the*
form of a serpent ;” nor “ *make use of the creature*
as an instrument in the intended fraud.” We are
 told that, “ Every man is tempted, when he is drawn
 “ away of his own lust, and enticed:” (*James*
 i. 14.) but that we have any other enemies to en-
 counter, or any other temptations to resist, than
 such

such as originate from the various passions of the mind, is a doctrine altogether repugnant to the clearest testimony of the scriptures; and a dark veil of obscurity has been thrown over this portion of scripture, *by cloathing unrighteousness with immortality, and giving real existence, and efficacious power to Baal and Ashteroth, or, if you wil', to Beelzebub the prince of the devils.*

Of the introduction of the knowledge of good and evil.

WE are told, (*Gen. i. 27.*) that “ God created man in his own image;” that is, he created man, “ to be immortal, and made him to be an “ Image of his own eternity.” (*Wisdom ii. 23.*) Nevertheless St. Paul informs us, that the dissolution of this earthly tabernacle, was consistent with the original designs of providence; and accordingly that the “ the creature was made “ subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason “ of him who hath subjected the same in hope.” (*Rom. viii. 20.*)

In this epistle to the Romans, the apostle appears to have had in view, a general vindication of the divine wisdom and goodness, toward *the whole race of mankind*, in subjecting the creature
to

to vanity, in hope of a better resurrection, and the attainment of that superior happiness to which “ *the sufferings of this present world are* “ *not worthy to be compared.*” (Rom. viii. 18.)—

Moreover, the arguments of the apostle are calculated to point out the riches of God’s goodness, as clearly to be discerned in the establishment of that godlike *covenant of grace*, which formed the basis of all his future dispensations, and which he proves to have been adapted with infinite wisdom, and goodness, to the peculiar exigencies of moral agents. The arguments adduced by the apostle, in support of his main proposition ; that the gospel which he preached, was “ the power of God unto salvation, to every one that *believed* ; are these :

The Jews, says he, notwithstanding they enjoyed many advantages, were chiefly benefited, “ because they believed the oracles,” or “ relied “ upon the promises of God.” (Rom. iii. 2.) for so I would render the passage.

In like manner the same “ faith was reckoned “ unto Abraham for righteousness.”—(Rom. iv. “ 3.) “ and he received the sign of circumcision, “ a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he “ had yet being uncircumcised:”—(Rom. iv. 11.) “ —Now it was not written for his sake alone, “ that it was imputed to him ; but for us also,

“ to

“ to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him
 “ that raised up Jesus from the dead, who was
 “ delivered for our offences, and was raised again
 “ for our justification.” (*Rom. iv. 22—25.*)—

St. Paul had it not in contemplation to point out to the Gentiles, the peculiar propriety of those laws, which were enacted for the moral government of the Jewish nation. It was admitted on all hands, that Abraham was the friend of God, and that his descendants were a peculiar people, and had been highly favoured of him : and upon this ground, the apostle takes upon him to prove to the Gentiles, by an appeal to the Jewish records, that God dealt with “ *the creature,*” in the beginning, as he did in a more particular manner, with the whole body of the Jewish nation, and with Abraham their father.

Thus the arguments of the apostle, when applied to the introduction of “ the knowledge
 “ of good and evil,” by one man’s transgression ; in consequence of which he tells us, “ sin
 “ entered into the world, and death by sin ;
 “ and so death passed upon all men, for that all
 “ have sinned ;” afford a full and satisfactory vindication of divine providence, whereby the
 “ creature was made subject to vanity.”

“ For

“ For if through the offence of one many be
“ dead, much more the grace of God, and the
“ gift by grace, hath abounded unto many.

“ And not as it was by one that sinned, so is
“ the gift; for the judgment was by one to
“ condemnation, but the free gift is of many of-
“ fences unto justification.

“ For if by one man's offence death reigned
“ by one; much more they which receive a-
“ bundance of grace, and of the gift of righte-
“ ousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus
“ Christ.

“ Therefore as by the offence of one, judg-
“ ment came upon all men to condemnation;
“ even so by the righteousness of one, the free
“ gift came upon all men unto justification of
“ life.

“ For as by one man's disobedience many
“ were made sinners, so by the obedience of
“ one, shall many be made righteous.

“ Moreover, the law entered, that the of-
“ fence might abound. For where sin abound-
“ ed, grace did much more abound: that as sin
“ hath reigned unto death, even so might grace
“ reign through righteousness, unto eternal life,
“ by Jesus Christ our Lord.” (*Rom. v. 15—21.*)
—compared with (*Rom. viii. throughout.*)

In

In short, all the arguments made use of by the apostle, appear to have an uniform tendency to vindicate the ways of God to man, upon supposition that Christ was the "*author*," as well as "*finisher of our faith*;"—that God who according to the unfearçhable riches of his wisdom and goodness, first "*subjected the creature to vanity*;"—did also "*die for our sins, and rise again for our justification*."

At the close of his epistle the apostle speaks, of this doctrine concerning the redemption of mankind, through him by whom the creature was made subject to vanity; by whom also we have now received the atonement; as comprehending the "*revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began*," but which "*now*" says he, "*is made manifest*,"—"*and by the scriptures of the prophets, (according to the commandment of the everlasting God,) made known to all nations, for the obedience of faith*." (*Rom. xvi. 25, 26.*)

Having thus endeavoured to exclude the supposed agency of Satan, and at the same time to demonstrate from the writings of St. Paul, that it is no impeachment of God's wisdom or goodness, to represent him as concerned in the introduction of the knowledge of good and evil, we

may now proceed to a more particular consideration of the delusive vision.

Of the erroneous suggestions of our first Parents.

“ AFTER other things set in order,” God formed man out of the ground, and placed him in the garden of Eden, to cultivate and preserve it. Of every tree of the garden they were permitted to eat food, but of the tree to discern the knowledge of good and evil, God had commanded them, of that only not to eat.

It ought well to be remembered, that in ascertaining the motives, which influenced the conduct of our first parents, we are not to argue as men who have been long blessed with the knowledge of God’s will, but rather to trace the operations of an untutored mind, co-operating with the designs of providence, toward the attainment of that knowledge, as the foundation of religious obedience.

Now though our first parents could not (*sensu morali*) discern between good and evil, so as to comprehend the necessity of obedience to a positive command of God: yet (*physicè*) they might readily apprehend, that the fruit of the tree,

tree, “to discern the knowledge of good and “evil,” might, possibly, have the same tendency to destroy life, as the other trees of the garden had to preserve it : and this apprehension would lead them to consider the prohibition, more in the light of a salutary admonition, than of a positive command, which they were bound implicitly to obey. I am inclined to think, therefore, that the supposed pernicious quality of the fruit of the tree, was considered by our first parents, as the *cause* of the admonition to abstain from it : and it is observable, that God said not unto them, as unto the Jews, who were under the law, eat ye not of the tree to discern the knowledge of good and evil,—“*I am the Lord.*”—(I who give this command am the almighty God, who formed you out of the ground, and placed you where you now are, in the midst of plenty,) but,—“In the day ye “do eat thereof, ye will perish by death ;” or as the woman expressed herself,—“Eat ye not “of that, neither touch it, *lest ye die.*” And under the persuasion, that danger was to be apprehended from the pernicious quality of the fruit, they would continue to abstain from the tree of knowledge, notwithstanding it was beau-

tiful to the sight, and the fruit thereof *apparently* good for food.—

How long the command, considered in the light of a salutary admonition, would have prevailed over the natural propensity, which we have in common with the rest of the creation; to indulge the appetite with the most grateful and delicious viands; it is not for us to determine. At length however, in a dream by night, there appeared to Eve the form of a serpent talking with her;—“ Wherefore said God, eat ye not
“ of every tree of the garden?—And the wo-
“ man said; we may eat of the fruit of the gar-
“ den, but of the tree which is in the midst of
“ the garden, God said,—Eat ye not of that,
“ neither touch it, lest ye die.”—In reply to this, the serpent assures the woman, that they would “ not perish by death.”—

Of the declarations made by the Serpent.

This assertion must not be considered as directly repugnant, to the previous declaration made by God, that in the day they did eat thereof, they would die. For,

We have endeavoured to prove, that the noxious quality of the fruit, was considered by our first parents as the sole cause of the prohibition.

And

And therefore the declaration made by the serpent, was tantamount only to the assurance that there was nothing of that noxious quality in the fruit of the tree, which could possibly cause the dissolution of their bodies, or shorten the natural period of their existence. So that the words of the serpent, when interpreted through the medium of their mistaken notions, with respect to cause of the prohibition, (and it is to be understood that the whole vision was founded upon this delusive basis,) conveyed no *false* assertion, notwithstanding it was *delusive*: (just as the staff appears crooked, when part of it is seen through the medium of a denser fluid,) and consequently, it does not militate against the assurance before given to Adam, that in the day they did eat of the tree to discern the knowledge of good and evil, they would die; it stands directly opposed only, to the mistaken notions of the woman, touching the pernicious quality of the fruit, which she considered as the sole cause of the admonition to abstain from it.

The event indeed, shews that the declaration of the serpent, so far from being absolutely false, was perfectly consistent with the true meaning of the original declaration made by God. For as
immediate

immediate death did not follow, (either as the effect of the fruit itself, or as the wages of their presumption) it is manifest thereby, that the preceding declaration, was not to be interpreted under any limitation with respect to time, as the words seemed to import, but agreeable to the latitude which is given to the meaning of the word day, in various other parts of scripture.

I am the more sollicitous to establish these observations, because I am aware, that having totally rejected the agency of Satan, it is incumbent upon me to demonstrate, that no *false* assertion was conveyed to Eve, through the visionary medium of the serpent. (For God cannot be the author of falsehood.) And most assuredly the two declarations, were no otherwise repugnant to each other, than as they became so, through the intervention of false notions on the part of the woman. God informed Adam, that if, at any time, they did eat of the tree to discern the knowledge of good and evil, they would die.—Notwithstanding therefore, the tree was beautiful to the sight, and the fruit thereof, apparently good for food, they still considered themselves as bound to abstain from it, lest (as God had been pleased to intimate,)

intimate,) the noxious quality of the fruit should destroy the texture of their bodies ; and under this persuasion, Eve is thus accosted by the serpent :

“ Wherefore said God, eat ye not of every tree of the garden ?”—Do you continue to abstain from the tree to discern the knowledge of good and evil, because you are apprehensive that the pernicious quality of the fruit, will destroy the texture of your bodies ? You may be assured that your fears in this respect, are totally without foundation, for no such event is to be dreaded.

“ And the serpent said unto the woman, ye will not perish by death.” &c.

Upon the whole, therefore, we may venture to conclude, that neither the introduction of the knowledge of good and evil ; nor the subsequent prolongation of the lives of our first parents, were events at all adverse to the council of God, or inconsistent with the declaration made to Adam, that in the day they did eat of the tree to discern the knowledge of good and evil, they would die.

Again,—the serpent assured the woman, that it was true,—“ God doth know,” says he, “ that in the day ye do eat thereof, your eyes
“ will

“ will be opened, and ye will be as Gods knowing good and evil.”

Particular attention must be paid to the words of this passage: “ *God* doth know,” says the serpent, “ that ye will be *as Gods*;—now Maimonides has well observed, that the term *Elohim*, God, or Gods, “ is equivocal, (see “ John x. 35.) and applicable to the supreme “ *Deity*, to *Angels*, or to *Provincial Governors* “ in their judicial capacity.” (*Maim. More Nevoch.* p. i. c. 3.)

The term *God*, therefore, must be understood to relate to the supreme creator of the universe; and *Gods* to those “ ministers of his “ who do his pleasure.” And this interpretation of the passage, is confirmed by the context; for it is said, “ ye shall be as Gods, “ *know-
“ ing good and evil:*” an expression totally inapplicable to God himself, but alike applicable to subordinate creatures of every denomination; whether of Thrones, Dominions, Principalities or Powers, in the Host of heaven, or of Apostles, Prophets and Teachers, among men. Thus Joab testified concerning David, that he was wise, “ according to the wisdom of an
“ angel

“ angel of God, to know all things that are in
 “ the earth ;” (2 *Sam.* xiv. 20.) and in the
 “ book of revelations, the angel replied to John,
 who “ fell down to worship him ;” “ see thou
 “ do it not : *for I am thy fellow-servant, and of*
 “ *thy brethren the prophets, and of them which*
 “ *keep the sayings of this book—worship God.*”
 (*Rev.* xxii. 8, 9.)

In a subsequent passage God affirms that the prediction of the serpent was accomplished : “ behold,” says he, “ the man is become as one
 “ of us, to know good and evil ;”—the assertion therefore was not only true, (for the intervention of the knowledge of God’s will, justified the comparison between men and angels,) but conveyed at the same time, the purport of a new and most important revelation. Through the medium of this vision, our first parents were assured that upon tasting of the tree to discern the knowledge of good and evil, they would by the attainment of that knowledge, be placed in some measure, upon a level with the higher orders of created beings, the ministers of God who do his pleasure.

Upon the whole, when we consider that the will of God, (or at least that the command to abstain from the tree to discern the know-

E

ledge

ledge of good and evil) was most probably made known to Adam in a dream; it is not to be wondered that the declarations of the serpent, should be opposed, with some degree of confidence, on the part of the woman, to the purport of the preceding revelation.—Adam was not furnished with those arguments, which the knowledge of good and evil might have suggested, in order to secure obedience to the divine command; whereas the purport of Eve's vision was compatible with the the indulgence of their appetites; (corresponding, moreover, to the evidence of their senses, which bore undeniable testimony to the luxuriant beauties of the tree, and to the apparent excellence of the fruit thereof,) and at the same time exhibited, the most flattering prospect of superior knowledge, to be obtained by the gratification of their desires: and accordingly, the solicitations of the woman at length prevailed.

“ And the woman saw that the tree was good
 “ for food, and beautiful to the sight: and it is
 “ honourable to obtain knowledge: and taking
 “ of the fruit thereof, she did eat, and gave also
 “ to her husband with her, and he did eat.”

The

The apprehension of danger being removed, the desire of knowledge, appears to have had a proper influence upon the mind of Eve; I say proper, because, as the historian observes, “ it “ is honourable to obtain knowledge :” Wisdom and “ the desire of discipline, which is the “ very true beginning of it,” (*Wisd.* vi. 17.) is congenial to the most virtuous dispositions. “ She goeth about seeking such as are worthy “ of her :—“ more to be desired, is she, than “ health and beauty, or the possession of thrones “ and sceptres, for she is a treasure unto man, “ that never faileth ; and, in all ages, entering “ into the souls of men, she maketh them friends “ of God and prophets.”—(*Wisdom.*)

Hitherto we have endeavoured only, to trace the motives which influenced our first parents : —we come now to consider the consequences of their conduct ; and as it does not appear that they were actuated by any base or dishonourable motives, so neither will it be found, I trust, that the wrath of God was kindled against them, in consequence of their transgression, and much less that his anger was bitter and implacable.

It would, indeed, be difficult to account for the reproach which has been cast upon our first parents, in these last ages of the world, were it not for the promptitude of mankind to estimate their offence, by the supposed severity of the punishment which was inflicted upon them by God. But we are not (as is too frequently the case) to “decline after many to wrest judgment,” (*Exod.* xxiii. 2.) or upon any account to censure others, without due regard to the circumstances of the case before us. God does not require us “to talk deceitfully for him,” or “to accept his person,” (*Job.* xiii. 7, 8.) the language of scripture is uniformly this; “come now let us reason together,”—(*Isaiah* i. 18.) “and ye shall know that I have “not done without cause, all that I have done, “saith the Lord.” (*Ezek.* xiv. 23.) and truly the equity of God’s judgments, is always conspicuous, upon the record of the historian, and clearly to be discerned in all his dealings with those men, whose lives and actions are written for our instruction. And permit me to observe, that it is no small presumptive argument, in proof that “we do not enquire wisely,” concerning this matter, when presuming upon the severity of the punishment inflicted, we infer
from

from thence the guilt of our first parents; namely, that no dishonourable mention is made of Adam, in any part of the old or new testament; on the contrary, the author of the book of Ecclesiasticus, places him at the head of a long list of worthies, and expressly tells us, that his memory was revered in after ages, and that his name was held in honour, by all his illustrious descendants, through many succeeding generations. (*Ecclus. xlix. 16.*)—but to return,

Of the effect of their conduct.

“ And the eyes of them both were opened,
 “ and they knew that they were naked.”

It is not said, their eyes were opened, and they *saw* that they were naked; but they *knew* that they were naked, and therefore the opening of their eyes, relates not to the organs of sight, but to the faculty of discernment: (Maim. M. Nevoch.) they knew that they were naked;

“ And

“ And they twisted the leaves of the fig-tree,
“ and made themselves girdles.”

The serpent declared that in the day they did eat of the tree to discern the knowledge of good and evil, their eyes would be opened: and accordingly they did eat thereof, and their eyes were opened;—“ and they knew that they were “ naked.”—That is, (say the advocates for the depravity of our first parents) they now became sensible of their crime; and these words they represent, as strongly expressive of shame, arising from the consciousness of guilt. But for my part, I cannot discern the smallest connection between the action and the motives which are assigned for it. Will a covering of fig-leaves, heal a wounded conscience?—Or could they hope thereby to appease the offended Deity? Surely their conduct more strongly indicates, a sense of modest bashfulness, and regard to decorum; which almost every where has taught the rude inhabitants of the desert, to make themselves girdles, and to conceal their nakedness.

If they did not know, before hand, that the offence would be great, what right have we to
conclude

conclude that it was so when committed ; or how can we who thus condemn others, hope ourselves to escape the righteous judgment of God, notwithstanding in matters of the utmost importance, we knowingly and wilfully transgress his commandments. But if the historian really meant, by the knowledge of their nakedness, to express their sense of shame, and contrition ; he would certainly not have carried on the metaphor, but would have told us plainly that when they perceived their nakedness, they endeavoured by prayer and supplication, to appease the offended Deity. Whereas he tells us, that when they knew that they were naked, they twisted the leaves of the fig-tree, and made themselves girdles.

Of the purport of the subsequent Vision.

“ And they heard the voice of the Lord
 “ God, walking in the garden, in the cool of
 “ the day ; and they hid themselves, both
 “ Adam and his wife, from the presence of
 “ the Lord God in the midst of the garden.”

“ Τὸ δειλινόν,” unquestionably relates to the time of the vision, and not to the “ still small voice

“ voice,” of the revelation itself. The nature of the vision is indeed sufficiently explained, by the effect which it produced. Adam heard the voice of the Lord God, as it were the voice of a man, walking in the garden ; and because he was naked, he sought to avoid his presence.

We are apt to conclude that Adam knew the voice which he heard to be “ the voice of the Lord God ;” whereas it is probable that he did not know this, (for it is the first instance recorded of an *open vision*,) till God charged him with having eaten of the tree, whereof he had before commanded him (in a dream by night) not to eat. It is only said, by way of introduction to the vision, (and the scope of the revelation points out the propriety of an open vision,) that they heard a voice, (which was, indeed, the voice of the Lord God,) as it were the voice of *a man like themselves*, walking in the garden, and calling upon them by name, as God did Samuel, (1 *Sam.* iii. 8.) and Adam and his wife hid themselves, because they were naked.

I need not observe that their conduct in this respect, was perfectly consistent with the motives, which before prompted them to make themselves girdles, and to conceal their nakedness.

“ And

“ And God called Adam, and said unto him.
“ Adam, where art thou? And he said unto
“ him: I heard the voice of you walking in
“ the garden, and I was afraid, because I am
“ naked, and I hid myself.”

Adam assigns at once the true cause of his
bashfulness: “ I was afraid, (says he) because
“ I am naked, and I hid myself.”

“ And God said unto him.—Who has told
“ thee that thou art naked? Surely of the tree,
“ concerning which I commanded thee, of that
“ only not to eat, of that thou hast eaten.”

The whole of this passage, has a manifest reference, to the circumstances of the preceding vision. The Serpent had declared, that if they did eat of the tree to discern the knowledge of good and evil, their eyes would be opened. They were not given to understand, at first, that such would be the result of their conduct; for God said “ eat not of it, *lest ye die:*” nevertheless God knew, that in the day they did eat thereof, their eyes would be opened.

Adam replied with becoming *truth* and sincerity,

F

“ And

“ And Adam said. The woman whom thou
 “ didst join with me, she gave me of the tree,
 “ and I did eat.”

Adam does not say, the woman whom thou
 didst form out of my side; but the woman
 whom thou didst join with me, and taught me
 to regard, (through the medium of a prophetic
 vision), as bone of my bones, and flesh of my
 flesh; she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.
 It is plain therefore, that Adam did not con-
 sider the *res visæ* of the prophetic vision, as
 real transactions, (which, indeed, were merely
 visionary), but replied in conformity with the
 general purport of the vision; “ the woman
 “ *whom thou didst join with me*, she gave me of
 “ the tree and I did eat.”

The expression “ ἔδωκας μετ’ ἐμῶν,” confirms
 this interpretation of the passage, for the verb
 Δίδωμι is used by the best Greek authors, to
 signify the giving and being given in marriage;
 and in the passage before us it is used to denote
 the junction of the woman with her own
 proper husband.

“ And

“ And God said unto the woman. Why
“ hast thou done this ?”

Not—What is this that thou hast done !—

“ And the woman said. The serpent de-
“ ceived me and I did eat.”

This she spake, in conformity with the strong impression, which the vision had left upon her mind ; and so far the assertion was strictly true. No question is put to the serpent, for it was merely the visionary form of the serpent, which was present to the mind of Eve.

“ And God said unto the serpent.—Because
“ thou hast done this, thou art debased beneath
“ all cattle, and beneath all the beasts which
“ are upon the earth. Upon thy breast and
“ belly shalt thou go, and feed on earth all
“ the days of thy life.”

“Επικατάρατος οὐ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν,”—
 Thou art debased beneath all cattle, for so I
 would render the passage, instead of—“curSED
 “above all cattle,” as more agreeable to the
 context. The same expression is used by the
 historian, (*Gen.* iv. 11.) in speaking of Cain’s
banishment. Again (*Gen.* ix, 25.) with reference
 to the *degradation* of Canaan. The same word
 (ἐπικατάρατοι ἔσε) occurs in the book of Joshua,
 where he tells the Princes, with whom he had
 unadvisedly made a league, that they should
 for ever be made, *hewers of wood*, and *drawers*
of water, for the house of his God, (*Josh.* ix.
 23.) Thus the *curse* pronounced against the
 Jews, was fulfilled in the *degradation* of their
 nation; when their enemies triumphed over
 them, and led them away captive. And the
 extreme of this *debasingment* (which the word is
 sometimes put to denote) consists in the total
annihilation, with which the impenitent sinner
 is threatened in the world to come.

The eagle affords not a more lively and signi-
 ficant emblem of majesty and strength; or the
 dove of simplicity; than the serpent of subtilty
 and deceit. And for this cause, as I before
 observed,

observed, the purport of the vision, was conveyed through the visionary medium of that detested reptile.

It is idle to suppose, that the serpent underwent a change in consequence of a transaction, which, with respect to the creature, was purely visionary ; such an opinion does not merit a serious confutation : we must be studious to adopt sentiments, more agreeable to the tenor of the preceding vision, and more conformable to the acknowledged import of the subsequent declarations.

Similar suggestions might have been conveyed to the mind of the woman, through the visionary medium of some domestic animal. But none of all those creatures, which were formed for the use and service of mankind, have a natural tendency, like the serpent, to excite that abhorrence and aversion, which proceeds from the unexpected appearance of a noxious reptile : sensations corresponding in their effect, to the disgust with which a virtuous mind, rejects the pernicious councils of the ungodly. And they are truly wise, who fly from sin as from the face of a serpent.—

We

We are not, therefore, so to understand the passage, as to conceive that the serpent which tempted Eve, was in fact degraded to the state and condition of a reptile, in consequence of his duplicity: on the contrary, it appears that this hateful reptile was first selected, (as affording a proper emblem of duplicity) to be the visionary medium of imparting delusive council to the mind of Eve. And accordingly, when the woman spake, in conformity with the *res visæ* of the delusive vision, and affirmed that the serpent beguiled her; then by a figure of speech, God accosts the serpent in the words before us,

“ Because thou hast done this thou art debased
 “ beneath all cattle, and beneath all the beasts
 “ which are upon the earth. Upon thy breast
 “ and belly shalt thou go, and feed on earth
 “ all the days of thy life.”

“ And I will put enmity between thee and
 “ the woman, and between thy seed and her
 “ seed; he shall subdue thy head, and thou
 “ shalt ensnare his heel.”

Here, dropping the allegory, we may observe that the former part of the prediction, (I will
 put

put enmity, &c.) was first verified in the conduct of Cain, who slew his brother, “because
 “his own works were evil and his brother’s
 “righteous;” and in after ages, by the conduct of those wicked persons, who from similar motives, “killed the prophets, and stoned
 “them that were sent unto them.” The latter clause of the sentence, unquestionably relates to the “seed of the woman;”—to him who being “born of a pure Virgin,” was long time conversant among his creatures.—That is, to Christ, “the author and finisher of our
 “faith;” who, “being delivered by the determinate council and foreknowledge of God
 “was taken, and by wicked hands was crucified and slain.” (*Acts* ii. 23.)

But why was it the “determinate council
 “of God,” that Christ should *die* for our redemption? shall we say, that the scriptures might be fulfilled, for thus it was written?—but why was it ordained before the world began, that Christ should suffer?—may we not reply, in the language of the apostle, because, “the creature was made subject to vanity, not
 “willingly, but by reason of him who hath
 “subjected the same in hope?”

Thus,

Thus, he who “ created man in his own
 “ image ; ” — “ came down from heaven, and
 “ was incarnate, by the Holy Ghost, of the
 “ Virgin Mary, and was made man. ” — He
 who laid the basis of religious obedience, in
 the “ knowledge of good and evil ; ” — during
 his abode on earth, exhibited a perfect pattern
 of obedience to the will of God. He who
 forewarned our first parents of the difficulties of
 life ; — was himself touched with the infirmities
 of human nature. And he who subjected the
 creature to vanity, in hope of a better resur-
 rection ; — purchased, by his own death, the
 redemption of his creatures ; and was himself
 “ the first born from the dead. ”

“ Thus it is written, and thus it behoved
 “ Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the
 “ third day : and that repentance and remission
 “ of sins should be preached in his name, among
 “ all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. ” (*Luke*
xxiv. 46, 47.)

“ And unto the woman he said. In multi-
 “ plying I will multiply thy pains and thy
 “ conception, with pangs shalt thou bring forth
 “ children : ” —

“ (Tov

“(Τὸν στεναγμὸν σε,” appears to be used, in this place, in a sense equivalent to “Τὰς συλλήψεις σε,” or Τὰς κυήσεις σε,” in other copies of the septuagint: and to signify the uneasiness of gestation.)

We are not, I presume, to consider this passage, in the light of a judicial sentence passed upon the woman; since we have no good reason to conclude, that the pains of child birth, were inflicted as a punishment, and do not in fact result, from the particular construction of the human frame.

It is true that bad habits, sloth and idleness, and every species of vice and debauchery, have a natural tendency to relax the solids, to weaken the mind, and to disorder all the functions of the body: and consequently to increase the uneasiness of gestation, and the dangers of parturition. And so far indeed, as in all other cases, there is a connection between sin and misery. But it is by no means equally certain, that if our first parent, had abstained from the tree of knowledge, she would have been totally exempt from the pains of child birth.

I am aware that having rejected the agency of Satan, it is equally incumbent upon me to

G

demon-

demonstrate, that no punishments were inflicted upon our first parents, in consequence of their transgression; as it was in the first instance, to prove that no false assertions, were conveyed to Eve through the medium of the serpent.

Let the skilful anatomist then determine, according to the principles of his art, whether the pains of child birth do, or do not, proceed from the particular construction of the human frame. Doubtless he will so account for them.

It follows, therefore, that the passage before us, is not to be considered, in the light of a judicial sentence, denouncing a punishment, adequate to the commission of a certain crime; but rather as a wise, a benevolent, and in some measure, a necessary admonition, of future difficulties to be encountered, and of dangers to be provided against; to which the promise of redemption, through "*the seed of the woman,*" apparently gave rise.

Thus the assurance of an ample retribution, at some future period, served as an introduction to the foreknowledge of that uneasiness in gestation, and danger in parturition, which was destined to be the hard lot of the female; and for which nothing can compensate, but the
protection,

protection, the assiduity, and indulgent tenderness of the husband.

“ And thy refuge shall be to thy husband,
“ and he shall protect you.”

(*Αποστροφή*, may signify either refuge or aversion. Aversion from the object of fear, or refuge toward the asylum from danger. It is used in this latter sense by Eurip. in *Med.* Thuc. Xen. and, I presume, in the passage now before us.

Κυριεύω, in like manner, does not more properly signify authority and power, than the protection which results from the proper exercise of authority. Thus *Κυριαζω*, exp. *απο κακῶ* Hefych.)

Saint Paul, in his first epistle to Timothy, observes that “ Adam was first formed, then “ Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but “ the woman being deceived was in the transgression.” Such was the argument which the apostle made use of, in order to evince the propriety of his admonitions to Timothy, touch-

ing the line of conduct which it would be proper for his female converts to pursue. The propriety of the argument has already been taken notice of, and the force of it pointed out. But as the apostle thought proper to take notice of the deception of the woman, in order to shew that it was principally owing to the want of that modest deference of opinion, and silent subjection, which he was studious to recommend; he did not care to dismiss the subject, without adverting to the words of God, as particularly addressed to Eve in consequence of her transgression.

The delicacy and tenderness of the apostle in this instance, is indeed truly descriptive of that holy spirit of wisdom which enlightened his understanding.

Having been led, by the subject he was upon, to observe that “ the woman being “ deceived was in the transgression:” he adds, “ notwithstanding she shall be saved in child “ bearing, if they continue in faith and charity “ and holiness with sobriety.”

His words are these. “ Σωθησεται δε,” but she shall be preserved, or protected,—by whom? most assuredly by her husband; of whom, in the preceding verse, she is exhorted to “ learn “ in

“in silence with all subjection.” (1 Tim. ii. 11.) and to this protection she becomes entitled, “δια της τηκενογονιας,” on account of her bringing forth children: not indeed unconditionally, but “εαν μενωσεν” if they, that is the husband and wife, continue “εν πισει” in faith, (or perhaps it may be rendered in *conjugal fidelity*, for the woman unquestionably forfeits her claim to protection, on account of her bringing forth children, and may be put away, if she committeth adultery), “και αγαπη” and love, “και αγιασμω,” and chasteness (that purity of body being meant, which consists in abstaining from fornication; for I doubt not but the word is here used, in the same sense as in Rom. iv. 19, and particularly in 1 Thes. iv. 3.) “μετα σωφροσυνης” with temperance. (Temperance and chastity being frequently mentioned together in scripture, in some measure, confirms the preceding observations.)

The argument of the apostle then is this. The woman being deceived was in the transgression: but she shall be protected, (by her husband) on account of her bringing forth children, (or in return for her care and anxiety in the bringing up of his offspring), if they continue in mutual faith, and love, and chasteness

ness with temperance. And this is perfectly consistent with what is written in the book of Genesis, if according to the septuagint we read, “and thy refuge shall be to thy husband, and “he shall protect you.”

From what has been said, I think it will be plain, that the apostle understood the expression, “καὶ αὐτός σε κυριεύσει,” to be significant of the protection, which the woman was entitled to expect from her husband: and the reason which he assigns for that protection, is manifestly deduced from the preceding admonition, (*Gen.* iii. 16.) of that uneasiness in gestation, and danger in parturition, which was destined to be the hard lot of the female, and for which (as we before observed), nothing can compensate, but the protection, the assiduity, and indulgent tenderness of the husband.

It does not appear, therefore, that any sort of punishment, was inflicted upon the woman, in consequence of her transgression.

“But unto Adam he said.—Because thou
 “hearkened unto the voice of thy wife and
 “hast eaten;—of the tree concerning which
 “I commanded thee, of that only not to eat,
 “of that thou hast eaten.—Cursed is the
 “ground in thy labours. With trouble shalt
 “thou

“ thou eat thereof all the days of thy life.
 “ Thorns and Thistles shall it bring forth
 “ unto thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of
 “ the field. In the sweat of thy brow shalt
 “ thou eat thy bread, until thou shalt return
 “ unto the earth from whence thou wast taken.
 “ For thou art earth, and shalt return to earth.”

I before observed that Adam was individually
 taxed, with having eaten of the tree, concerning
 which God had commanded him, of that only
 not to eat. Nevertheless we are not, I presume,
 to consider the passage before us, in the light
 of a judicial sentence, passed upon Adam, in
 consequence of his transgression : for even now
 the field of the slothful man, is quickly over-
 grown with thorns and thistles, and the earth is
 cursed in his labours ; neither was it ever de-
 signed by the Almighty, that such an one
 should eat the fat of the land : but rather,
 “ that if any would not work, neither should
 “ he eat.” (2 *Theff.* iii. 10.)

We are exhorted not to “ hate laborious
 “ work, neither the husbandry which the Most
 “ High hath created ;” (*Ecclus.* vii. 15.) for
 sloth and idleness, so far from contributing to
 health and happiness, or the enjoyment of life ;
 have a manifest tendency to vitiate the mind,
 and

and to relax the body ; and will speedily bring a man into poverty, disease, and shame.

We are not therefore to suffer our judgment to be misled, by the luxuriant fictions of the poets, while they describe in all the charms of verse, the golden age, and happy state of man ; when without care and toil they ate the spontaneous productions of the ground.

All that we can infer from the general tenor of the passage before us is, that it pleased God, (as in the case of Eve) previously to admonish Adam of the necessity of that laborious work, which he had created ; and of the natural propensity of the earth, if I may so express myself, to disappoint the feeble exertions of a slothful husbandman.

In this short converse with the Deity, Adam was instructed in the great outlines of his duty : that he was not to covet a solitary subsistence for himself alone ; but by labour and industry, to provide for the wants and necessities of his family. That he was not to be discouraged, if the earth did not at all times yield her increase, and sufficiently reward his toil : but through patience and persevering industry, to provide bread for his household, by the sweat
of

of his brow ; until he should return unto the ground from whence he was taken.

“ Neque enim natura pateretur ut id quod
“ esset de terra, nisi in terra maneret.” (*Cic.
de Rep. lib. iii.*)

With respect to the mortality of the body, we may observe ; that the gradual increase, and subsequent decay of vegetables ; of the whole animal creation ; and of our own bodies in particular ; will not permit us to doubt, whether a body, formed of the same materials ; (*Gen. ii. 7. and xviii. 27.*) organized in the same manner ; (*1 Cor. xv. 47—49.*) and requiring the same nutrition ; (*Gen. ii. 16.*) was or was not liable to the same corruption.

St. Paul affirms in his Epistle to the Corinthians, that “ the first man is of the earth, “ earthy ;” that is, liable to the same corruption with our own bodies. But had he not asserted this, we might have drawn the same conclusion, from the command given to our first parents to increase and multiply ; since we are told that the angels, which cannot die, “ do neither marry nor are given in marriage.”

It does not appear therefore, that any sort of punishment, was inflicted upon Adam in consequence of his transgression.

H

Having

Having now distinctly considered the several parts of this prophetic vision ; it may not be improper to dismiss the subject, with some few general remarks upon it.

In the sentence pronounced upon the serpent ; we have been able to discover, nothing more than a prediction, of a full and complete redemption of mankind, through him by whom we have now received the atonement.

In like manner, the words addressed to each of our first parents, served only to convey to them, a previous admonition of their respective duties, and of the difficulties which they would have to encounter.

Thus, God took the man whom he formed, and placed him in the garden of Eden :—and our Saviour, in like manner, when he first made his appearance upon earth ; was led by the spirit into the wilderness :—*for the same important purpose of preparatory admonition.*

The revelations made to each were as similar, as the difference of circumstances would admit. The visionary medium of temptation, was in both cases the same : the nature, and I may add, the time and opportunity of the temptation, were likewise similar. And lastly, the
vision

vision of our Saviour terminated, like that of Adam, “ in a prefiguration of the trials he was “ to combat in the execution of that great office “ he was about to undertake.” (*See Farmer’s essay on Christ’s temptation in the wilderness, p. 103.*)

A comparative view of these two parts of scripture, will suggest many things to an attentive reader, which I need not be solicitous to point out.

The reader, I am persuaded, will take in good part, what has been said in vindication of his illustrious progenitor; and his goodness will bear with me, when I assert that it is no honour to christians of the present generation that the name of their first parent, is become a by-word and proverb of reproach among them.

After a diligent and impartial examination of the subject, I see no cause to withdraw from Adam and Eve, that tribute of esteem and veneration, which appears most justly due to those illustrious personages, of whose blood God was pleased to form all nations of the world.

Frankness and sincerity, are conspicuous throughout the whole of their conduct; and on

the part of God, unfearchable wisdom, and benevolence toward his creatures.

In a word, I clearly discern, to the fatisfaction of my own mind, that the tranfactions in Paradise were prelufive only, or fubfervient to the introduction of man, in the capacity of a moral agent, upon the great ftage of life. And as fuch he now comes before us, led by the hand of his Creator and Redeemer.

“ And Adam called his wife’s name Life;
“ as the mother of all living.”

Adam called his wife’s name Life, becaufe he was perfuaded, that ſhe would be the common parent of a numerous progeny; according to the command which they had received, to increafe and multiply, and agreeable to the ſubſequent affurance, that the feed of the woman ſhould ſubdue the ſerpent’s head.

The viſion wherein all thoſe creatures, which God formed out of the ground, were preſented unto Adam; to the intent that he might learn what to call them: would inſtruct him, in like manner, to give names expreſſive of the peculiar properties,

properties, of the person, creature, or thing signified thereby.

This art of imposing names, Plato acknowledges that the Greeks derived from the Barbarians: meaning thereby the Hebrews. (*Euseb. Præp. Evang. Lib. xii. c. 6.*) See Mr. Locke's Book "*Of Words*," which, I presume, is the most complete treatise upon the subject that is extant in any language.

From this remark, that "Adam called his wife's name Life, *as the mother of all living*;" I think we may reasonably conclude that the preceding transactions, had not the smallest tendency, to sow the seeds of discord between our first parents, whom God created alone.

It does not appear that they lamented their fallen state, as we call it, since they neither seem to have expressed contrition for their fault; nor to have implored forgiveness. Much less does it appear, that they ever reproached each other; or considered themselves, as the unhappy parents of a miserable and wretched progeny.

"And the Lord God made for Adam and
"his Wife, garments of skins, and cloathed
"them."

"Legimus,

“ Legimus, cap. iii. geneſeos com. vii. pri-
 “ mos parentes, lege Dei violata, nuditatem
 “ agnoviſſe, et ſtatim *confutis foliis ficulneis*
 “ *ſubligacula ſibi confeciſſe*. Primæ ergo veſtes,
 “ quibus mortales unquam uſi ſunt, ex arbo-
 “ rum foliis factæ erant, primosque homines
 “ earum inventores atque textores fuiſſe conſtat ;
 “ ita ut earum originem gentiles fruſtra quærant
 “ apud Pelasgum, aut Mercurium, aut Miner-
 “ vam, aut Arachnen, ut Diodorus lib. v.
 “ Plinius, et alii.”—“ Ergo Deum ipſum
 “ auctorem veſtium credunt Hebræi, eaſque ex
 “ pellibus factas fuiſſe tradunt. Legimus enim
 “ *Geneſ. iii. com. xxii. Fecit Dominus Deus*
 “ *Adamo et uxori ejus tunicas pelliceas, quibus*
 “ *veſtivit eos.*” (*Braunius de veſtitu Vet. Heb.*
lib. i. c. i. § viii.)

In the above paſſage, the leaves of the fig-
 tree, with which our firſt parents made them-
 ſelves girdles, are, I think, improperly called,
 “ Primæ veſtes,” ſince they did not apply them
 as garments but merely to conceal their naked-
 neſs.

I need not obſerve that the cloathing them
 with the ſkins of animals, as deſcribed by Moſes ;
 (not-

(*notwithstanding the immediate consequence of their transgression was, the knowledge of their nakedness:*) is a manifest indication of God's concern for their future happiness and welfare. The Jewish doctors affirm, that God cloathed Adam and his wife, as he did Aaron and his sons (*Levit. viii. 13.*) with "garments of honour." (*Ecclus. xlv. 7.*)

The Jews might possibly be led to put this construction upon the passage, from that part of the Levitical law, which directs, that "the priest that offereth any man's burnt offering, even the priest shall have to himself *the skin* of the burnt-offering which he hath offered:" &c. (*Levit. vii. 8.*) But however that may be, the passage affords a strong presumptive proof, that the anger of the Lord was not kindled against them in consequence of their transgression.

Having mentioned that part of the Levitical law, which ordains that the priest shall have *the skin* of the burnt-offering; I might observe also, that some part of the flesh of the victims, was appointed to be set apart, for the maintenance of those who served at the altar. Consequently, if the animals, whose skins were made use of by Adam, were not killed purposely

posely for food, as some would have it, but slain in sacrifice; it will still follow, even upon that hypothesis, that animal food, was most probably, allowed, and generally made use of by mankind before the deluge.

“ And God said.—Behold Adam is become
 “ as one of us, to know good and evil.”

It has already been shewn that these words, are by no means applicable to the supreme Being. The expression therefore, must be understood to imply, that the man was now placed, in some measure, upon a level with angels, those “ ministers of God, who do his “ pleasure :” agreeable to the declaration of the serpent, that in the day they did eat of the tree, to discern the knowledge of good and evil; they would be as Gods.

“ And now let him not stretch forth his
 “ hand, and take of the tree of life, and eat
 “ and live for ever.”

In this passage, “*ποτὲ* suam exercet auctori-
 “*tatem.*” (*Mat. Devarii de Græ. Ling. par-*
ticulis,) as though it had been written *μὴ ἐκτείνῃ*
ποτὲ let him not in future stretch forth his hand,
 &c. let him not, (contrary to the designs of
 Providence, and to the purport of the preceding
 vision) endeavour to procure a precarious sub-
 sistence, from the spontaneous productions of
 the garden; but rather let him keep flocks and
 herds, and learn to cultivate the ground.

“ And the Lord God sent him forth, from
 “ the garden of pleasure, to cultivate the
 “ ground from whence he was taken.”

He sent him forth, not as a punishment, but
 to the intent, that he might cultivate the ground
 from whence he was taken.

In all probability, the dismissal of our first
 parents from the garden of Edem; preceded the
 descent of the former rains, which in the cli-
 mate of Judea, usually fall about the middle of
 September. For immediately after the descent
 of these rains, which prepare the ground for

cultivation, the peasants begin to sow their wheat, and barley, and soon after to plant their lentils. The cloathing Adam with the skins of animals, before his dismissal from Edem; seems also to indicate the approach, of the inclement season of the year.

“ And he sent forth Adam, and caused him
“ to dwell before the Garden of Pleasure.”—

I think it probable that Adam, upon his dismissal from Paradise, followed the stream of the lesser Jordan, the river which went out of Edem to water the garden: for the long continuance of the drought of summer, in the climate of Judea, would render this precaution necessary.

The borders of the Lake Samochonitis, (about fifteen miles distant from the springs of Jordan) are marshy, and liable to sudden inundations.

The river Jordan flowing from Panium,
“ *divides the marshes and fens of the lake Seme-*
“ *chonitis. Joseph. lib. iii. de bello. c. 10.*
Whiston.

But of the lake of Gennesareth, he says,
“ Its waters are sweet, and very agreeable
“ for

“for drinking: for they are finer than *the*
 “*thick waters of other fens*. The lake is also
 “pure; and on every side ends directly at the
 “shores, and at the sand.” *Ib.*

It is therefore probable that our first parents followed the course of the river Jordan, till they came to the Lake of Tiberias, and took up their abode in some part of that delightful region.

In confirmation of this opinion, I might cite many passages from the Talmudists, relating to the city of Adam, so called (as they affirm) in commemoration of the first settlement of mankind; and of Chebron where he was buried. But those passages I omit, as they prove only the prevalence of a tradition; concerning the settlement of our first parents, in the region of Galilee about Jordan.

This country, with respect to the relative situation of the Wilderness, wherein Moses wrote his history; and the land of Edem; was certainly *before the Garden of Pleasure*; and so far the traditions of the Talmudists, correspond with the writings of Moses; and in some measure, confirm the opinion that, God caused Adam to dwell in the land of Galilee, when he sent him forth, to cultivate the ground from whence he was taken.

“ And he placed a cherubim with a flaming
“ sword brandished, to keep the way of the
“ tree of life.”——

This cherubim was an angel, by whose ministry, God purposed to prevent the return of our first parents to the garden of Edem.

The cherubims, or angels, spoken of in the construction of the tabernacle, were nothing more than emblematical representations of God's ministering spirits.

It does not follow that this angel, armed with a flaming sword, was visible to Adam: and much difficulty seems to have arisen, from the supposition that he was so.

Neither is it at all certain, that our first parents, were disposed to return back to the garden of Edem: we learn only, from the passage before us, that it was not the will of God, that they should return thither.

The words of Moses, bring to our recollection the story of Balaam, as it is recorded in the 22d chapter of the book of Numbers. From whence it appears, that God commanded a che-

cherubim with a flaming sword brandished, to oppose the wayward prophet in his journey.

And certainly, if Adam had acted as Balaam did, the anger of the Lord, would in like manner have been kindled against him. Then, indeed, his eyes would have been opened, and he would have seen, the angel of the Lord standing in the way, with a sword drawn in his hand, to prevent his return to the tree of life.

“ And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she
 “ conceived, and brought forth Cain, and
 “ said; I have obtained a man through God.”

It is by no means clear that this expression, “ I have obtained a man through God,” is significant of the hope she entertained, that the promise of redemption, would now speedily be fulfilled, by the man whom she had obtained: it seems rather to relate to the “ great pain and “ peril of child-birth,” from which, through God’s assistance, she had recently been delivered.

“ A

“ A woman when she is in travel hath
 “ sorrow, because her hour is come : but as
 “ soon as she is delivered of the child, she
 “ remembereth no more the anguish, for joy
 “ that a man is born into the world.” *John*
 “ xvi. 21.) just so it was, I conceive, in the
 case of Eve ; but when she was delivered of
 the child, she rejoiced in the acquisition, and
 devoutly acknowledged herself indebted to God,
 for a happy deliverance out of those troubles,
 of which she had previously been admonished.

“ And again, she brought forth his brother
 “ Abel.

The words are, “ Καὶ προσέθετο τεκεῖν,” which
 may seem to express, something more than
 merely, that she *again* brought forth a son.
 But upon comparing this passage with, *Gen.*
 xxv. 1.—xxxviii. 5, 26.—xliv. 23. and other
 places, where the same expression occurs, it
 will be found equivalent only to πάλιν ἔτεκε,
 she *again* brought forth his brother Abel.

It does not follow that this was her second
 child, it is more probable that it was not :
 neither

neither do we certainly know, at what time these children were born.

“ And Abel became a pastor of sheep, but
“ Cain cultivated the ground.”

The different occupations of the two brothers, no less than the subsequent event, (v. 8.) seems to indicate, that there was a considerable disparity between them, in point of age and strength.

The tending of “ a few sheep in the wilderness,” was not a laborious occupation like that of an husbandman. Rachel kept the sheep of Laban; (*Gen.* xxix. 6.) Joseph at the age of seventeen years, was with the flock; (*Gen.* xxxvii. 2.) and David, was “ but a youth,” when he left his father’s sheep, to carry meat for his brethren to the camp. (*1. Sam.* xvii. 33.) Cain therefore, we may suppose, on account of his superior strength, was employed in cultivating the ground; while Abel, who comparatively speaking, was but a youth, pastured the flock.

“ And it came to pass, after certain days,
“ that Cain brought of the fruits of the earth,
“ an

“ an offering to God. And Abel he also
 “ brought of the firstlings of his sheep, and
 “ of their fat.”

The joint presentation of their respective oblations, appears to indicate that some stated periods were before observed, by our first parents; either in commemoration of past transactions, or in gratitude for certain benefits received. And if so “ καὶ ἐγένετο μεθ’ ἡμέρας,” most probably, does not relate to the commencement, of gratuitous oblations to the Deity: but rather, to an event which happened “ after certain days,” to Cain and Abel, at the presentation of their accustomed offerings.

“ S. Chrysostomus ad ista Mosis verba.
 “ Factum est autem in fine dierum, ut offerret
 “ Cain de fructibus terræ munera Domino.
 “ Vide quomodo naturæ conditor scientiam
 “ conscientiæ indidit. Quis enim illum, dic
 “ oro, ad hanc cognitionem perduxit? nemo
 “ nisi animi sui conscientia. Obtulit, inquit,
 “ de fructibus terræ sacrificium Domino, vidit
 “ enim, perspectum que habuit decere, ut Deo,
 “ tanquam possessionum suarum Domino, ali-
 “ quid

“ quid ex rebus suis offerret; non quòd ille
 “ eo indigeret, sed ut gratum animum indi-
 “ caret, qui tali beneficio fruebatur. Et paulo
 “ post tam de Abele, quam de Caino verba
 “ faciens; neque ille doctorem aliquem habuit,
 “ neque hic monitorem, et consiliarium; sed
 “ uterque conscientiae suae monitu, et sapientiâ
 “ humano generi divinitus datâ ad oblationem
 “ istam incitabatur.

“ Et ad populum Antiochenum (*Homil.*
 “ XII.) de Abele loquens; Neque enim ab ullo
 “ edoctus, nec lege accepta, quæ de primitiis
 “ aliquid constituebat; sed animi sui induc-
 “ tione propriaque conscientia doctus sacri-
 “ ficium illud offerebat.

“ His, quos jam citavimus, autoribus rectè
 “ accenseri posse videntur *Justinus Martyr*,
 “ *Irenæus*, *Turtullianus*, *Cyrillus Alexandrinus*,
 “ alique nonnulli scriptorum veterum, qui
 “ sacrificia *Judæorum* ea de causa instituta
 “ judicabant, quod populus diu in *Ægypto*
 “ hujusmodi religionibus assuetus in unius
 “ veri Dei cultu vix aliter conteneri potuisset,
 “ nisi iis sibi indultis ritibus, et in religionem
 “ suam tralatis, quibus quidem et diu assu-
 “ everat, et maxime quoque delitus erat.”

(*Outram de Sacrif. Lib. I. c. i. § 6.*) et paulo post.

“ Idem de sacrificiorum origine (ut mox videbimus) *Maimonidi* visum, idem etiam “ *R. Levi Ben Gerson*, ubi verba ipsius (*ad Gen. cap. 4.*) fatis docent.

“ *Cainus* et *Abel* (quemadmodum diximus) “ viri valde sapientes erant; atque ita factum, “ ut, cùm ad laborum suorum finem propositum “ pervenissent, uterque ex facultatibus suis “ munus Deo offerret: ejusque muneris offe- “ rendi ratio, ut mihi videtur, illa fuit; quod “ à Deo (cui laus) quæ nascuntur omnia, “ administrari scirent, deumque eorum veram “ esse causam; vel forte ex iis munus offere- “ bant, quod omnia ab eo planè creata esse “ intelligerent.

“ Hos sequitur *Isaacus Abrabanel*. (*in præfat. ad Levitic.*) “ *Adamus et filii ejus sacrificia offerebant, quia ita se Deum colere putabant.* “ Quibus, ex recentioribus, suffragatur vir “ doctissimus *Hugo Grotius*, (*ad Gen.*) qui “ non ullo Dei jussu, sed dictante ratione “ honorem Deo etiam conspicuum habendum, “ idque optimè fieri posse datis Deo iis, quæ “ homini sunt carissima, *Cainum et Abelem sacrificasse* judicat.”

The

The presentation of gifts, therefore, was not of divine appointment; but proceeded originally from a just and lively sense of gratitude to God, whom men were accustomed to regard, as the bountiful giver of every good thing which they possessed.

And this *Maimonides*, with his usual sagacity and penetration, endeavours to prove (*More. Nevuch.* p. iii. c. 32.) from those passages in scripture, which clearly demonstrate, that the law was a schoolmaster, and that God delighted not, in any of those sacrifices, which were ordained by Moses; but in that purity of heart, and pious disposition of mind, which accompanied the oblation; and which rendered the free-will offerings of Abel, and the gifts of those who, with a willing mind contributed to the service of the tabernacle, acceptable in the sight of God. (*Exod.* xxxv. 21.) Thus we read, in the book of the prophet Jeremiah.

“ I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people.” (*Jer.* vii. 22, 23.) (see also

1. *Sam.* xv. 22.—*Isaiab.* i. 11.—*Micah.* vi. 6.
—*Pf.* 1. 7—15. and numberless other passages
of scripture.)

What shall we say then? that the oblations
of Cain and Abel, could not possibly be ac-
ceptable unto God; because he hath declared,
that he delighteth not in burnt-offerings and
sacrifices? nay, but the offerings of a grateful
mind, are always acceptable unto God, and
“whosoever shall give you a cup of water to
“drink in my name, because ye belong to
“Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not
“lose his reward.” (*Mark.* ix. 41.)

Cain and Abel, are said to have brought their
respective offerings, which expression, I appre-
hend, does not mean simply that each of them
presented an oblation to the Deity; neither does
it at all favour the supposition, that their offer-
ings were placed, upon two different altars:
but rather that they brought their respective
oblations unto Adam.

And this supposition is the more probable;
for according to the law of Moses, a memorial,
or part, only of such offerings, as were pre-
sented unto God, were consumed upon the
altar; and Aaron and his sons, were suffered
to partake of the remainder. (*Levit.* ii. 3.)

And

And so in like manner, I apprehend, the whole family of Adam, were accustomed upon such occasions, to partake in common of those gifts; which were first presented to the Deity, with suitable acknowledgments of his bounty.

We know that a similar practice, prevailed in after ages, and that the Gentiles partook in common of those meats, which had been presented in the idol's temple. (1. *Cor.* viii. 10.)

St. Paul likewise reproves the Corinthians because, when they came together into one place to eat, (at the celebration of the Lord's supper,) every one took before other his supper, and one was hungry and another was drunken &c. (1 *Cor.* xi. 20, 21.)

I am inclined to think therefore, that upon this occasion, a feast was prepared in honor of God; and that the whole family of Adam, were assembled as usual, to partake in common of those gifts and oblations, which Cain and Abel had prepared.

“ And God had respect unto Abel, and to
 “ his gifts, but unto Cain and to his offerings,
 “ he had not respect.”

We

We know that “ Abel offered unto God a “ more excellent (πλεῖονα *ample*) sacrifice than “ Cain, by faith.” (*Heb.* xi. 4.) still however, some difficulty occurs, as to the manner in which God signified either his approbation or displeasure.

Not, I presume, by sending down fire from above, to consume the sacrifice: for it certainly does not appear, that the oblations of Cain and Abel, were presented (as the supposition implies) upon two separate altars.

It is much more probable, that God signified *to Adam*, his approbation of Abel and of his gifts, in preference to those of Cain; when they came to present their respective offerings.

Thus upon a similar occasion, Saint Paul reproved the hypocrisy of Ananias and Sapphira his wife, when they came, to lay the price of the land which they had sold, at the apostles feet.

I mention this instance, because I apprehend, that the particular offence of Cain, which brought upon him the immediate displeasure of God, and the reprehension of his parent, was similar to that of Ananias.

And

And if this should prove to be the case, it will appear still more probable, that Adam (like St. Paul) was commissioned to reprove Cain; and at the same time to acquaint him, that God would not accept his offerings.

“ And it grieved Cain exceedingly, and his countenance fell.”

This manifest indication of God's displeasure, could not but excite grief and confusion of face.

“ And the Lord said unto Cain.—Why art thou grieved, and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou dost rightly present, but not rightly divide thine offerings, dost thou not sin?”

In a former passage, Cain and Abel, are said to have *brought their offerings*: εὖν ὁρῶς προσενέγκης, seems therefore to relate, to the propriety of the practice itself, as having originated in a lively sense of gratitude to God: ὁρῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, to the particular offence,
for

for which God thought proper to rebuke Cain ; which appears to have consisted, in a deceitful substitution of a part only, for the whole of the *professed* oblation.

Thus in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, (*Acts* v. 1.) they, indeed, bore testimony, to the faith of the believing multitude ; “ who “ sold their possessions, and brought the prices “ of the things that were sold, and laid them “ down at the apostles feet :” (*Acts* iv. 34, 35.) but then, they were guilty of Cain’s hypocrisy and deceit, in keeping back part of the price of the land, while they professed to make a voluntary oblation, of the whole amount of their estate.

We are given to understand that God’s disapprobation of Cain, and of his offerings, was signified at the time of their presentation : so that ὁρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, does not relate to a subsequent fraud, in the distribution ; but rather to a previous attempt, (as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira) to render that distribution unequal, by a deceitful substitution of a part only, for the whole of the professed oblation.

That Cain was guilty of some such offence as this, appears probable, from St. Paul’s
assertion

assertion that Abel offered “ πλειονα θυσιαν,” a more *ample* sacrifice than Cain by faith. (*Heb.* xi. 4.) Which agrees with the supposition, that the offence was given, previous to the oblation of his scanty sacrifice.

Again St. Jude says of the false teachers, which had crept in unawares; “ Woe unto
“ them! for they have gone in the way of
“ Cain, and ran greedily after the error of
“ Balaam for reward,” &c. thereby intimating, that Cain and Balaam, were actuated by the same self-interested motives, which distinguished the false teachers; who “ subverted
“ whole houses, teaching things which they
“ ought not for filthy lucre sake.” (*Tit.* i. 11.)

Thus “ by faith Abel offered unto God a
“ more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which
“ he obtained witness that he was righteous,
“ God testifying of his gifts; and by it he
“ being dead yet speaketh.” (*Heb.* xi. 4.)

“ Be calm. His refuge will be unto thee,
“ and thou shalt protect him.”

This passage is somewhat similar to that which occurs, *Gen.* iii. 16. and “ ἄρξεις” in like manner, is here put to signify protection or assistance. The same word is used *Gen.* xxiv. 2. and again 1. *Sam.*

xxii. 14. to denote the care which a faithful servant takes, of those things which are committed to his trust: so that without putting a forced construction upon the passage, ἀρξεις may be made significant of care and protection. —See also *Isaiab.* iii. 5, 6.

That Cain himself, so understood the words of God, may be collected from his subsequent reply, (*Gen.* iv. 9.) “Am I my brother’s keeper?” which reply was manifestly drawn, from the previous admonition which he received, not to harbour resentment against his brother, but to be ready upon all occasions, to afford him assistance and protection. And to this passage, I apprehend, St. John alludes when he says, “For this is the message, that ye heard *“from the beginning,* that we should love one another;” for he immediately adds, “not as Cain, &c.” (1 *John* iii. 11.) It has already been suggested that Abel, comparatively speaking, was but a youth; and consequently it is but natural to suppose, that he would apply to Cain, whenever he stood in need of assistance or protection.

“And Cain said unto Abel his brother,
 “let us go into the field: and it came to pass
 “while

“ while they were in the field, that Cain rose
 “ up against Abel his brother and slew him.”

“ And wherefore slew he him? because his
 “ own works were evil and his brother’s righ-
 “ teous. (1. *John* iii. 12.)

And as virtue begets respect, and that
 respect envy in those, who are not sol-
 licitous to deserve the approbation of man-
 kind; so the wicked always have been, and
 ever will continue to be, at enmity with the
 good. Their reasoning will always be such
 as Solomon has described: “ Our lives are
 “ short, and there is no hope for us here-
 “ after, therefore let us speedily use the
 “ creatures like as in youth.—Let us oppress
 “ the poor righteous man, let us not spare the
 “ widow, nor reverence the ancient gray hairs
 “ of the aged. Let our strength be the law
 “ of justice: for that which is feeble is found
 “ to be nothing worth. Therefore let us lie
 “ in wait for the righteous, because he is not
 “ for our turn, and he is clean contrary to
 “ our doings: he upbraideth us with our
 “ offending the law, and objecteth, to our
 “ infamy, the transgressions of our education.
 “ He professeth to have the knowledge of

“ God: and he calleth himself the child of
 “ the Lord. He was made to reprove our
 “ thoughts. He is grievous unto us even to
 “ behold, for his life is not like other mens,
 “ his ways are of another fashion.—Let us
 “ examine him with despitefulness and torture,
 “ that we may know his meekness, and prove
 “ his patience. Let us condemn him with a
 “ shameful death: for by his own saying, he
 “ shall be respected.” *Wisdom* ch. ii.

Such has been the language of the wicked,
 and such their conduct toward the righteous,
 throughout all ages of the world, and so it
 must needs be.

“ And the Lord God, said unto Cain.—
 “ Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I
 “ know not; am I my brother’s keeper?”

This reply, as we before observed, was
 manifestly suggested, by the tenor of the pre-
 ceding admonition, to abstain from anger,
 and to protect his brother.

It has likewise been shewn, that our Saviour
 alluded to this passage, when he told the
 Jews, who sought to kill him, that they were
 of

of their father the devil, and that the lusts of their father they would do. (*see p. 10.*) “He
 “ was a murderer from the beginning, and
 “ abode not in the truth, because there is no
 “ truth in him. When he speaketh a lye, he
 “ speaketh of his own, for he is a liar and the
 “ father of it.” (*John viii. 44.*)

Which words are particularly descriptive, of the falshood and wickedness of Cain; for as it is certain that he was a murderer, so it is plain also, from the passage before us, that he was a liar and the father of it.

“ And the Lord said.—What hast thou
 “ done? the voice of thy brother’s blood,
 “ crieth unto me from the ground.”

Here the expression is, “ τί πεποίηκας;” and not as in the former passage (*Gen. iii. 13.*)
 “ τί τῷτο ἐποίησας.”

St. Paul alluding to this passage, observes that the blood of Christ, “ speaketh better
 “ things than that of Abel.” (*Heb. xii. 24.*) For we “ who sometimes were far off, are made
 “ nigh by the blood of Christ;” (*Eph. ii. 13.*)
 “ which cleanseth us from all sin.” (*1 John i. 7.*)
 They

They only will be deemed guilty of the body and blood of Christ, who notwithstanding they “have tasted of the good word of God, and “the powers of the world to come,” continue in sin, and thereby, “crucify to themselves “the son of God afresh, and put him to an “open shame.” (*Heb. vi. 6.*)

“And now thou art cursed from the ground “which hath opened its mouth, to receive thy “brother’s blood from thy hand.—Wherefore “thou shalt cultivate the ground, and it shall “not be granted, to yield unto thee its “strength.—Lamenting and trembling shalt “thou be upon the earth.”

Although the two passages may at first sight appear similar, yet there is a manifest difference, between the words which were addressed to Adam, (*Gen. iii. 17—19.*) and the sentence which is here passed, upon the murderer of his brother.

A previous intimation was given to Adam, that thorns and thistles, would quickly spring up of themselves, and disappoint the feeble exertions of a slothful husbandman.

But

But here it is expressly affirmed, that God would not permit the earth, to yield her increase; and that *Cain* should cultivate the soil in vain.

In some copies of the septuagint (which however I must be allowed to call, less authentic than that of Wechel,) instead of “*γένων καὶ τρέμων,*” we read according to our present version, “*σαλευόμεν καὶ ἀκαταστατῶν,*” that is, say the scholiasts, not remaining in any one place. But it does not appear that he continued a vagabond upon the earth, for presently after we read of his having built a city. I prefer therefore the reading, which seems to indicate, that it was the will of God, that Cain should still continue to live upon the earth; but that he should spend the rest of his days, in sorrow and contrition, for the grievous sin which he committed, in murdering his brother.

With such terrors were the Israelites threatened, if they disobeyed the commandments of the Lord.

“ And it shall come to pass, if thou wilt
 “ not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy
 “ God, to observe to do, all his command-
 “ ments and his statutes, which I command
 “ thee this day; that all these curses shall
 “ come

“ come upon thee, and overtake thee.”—
 “ Thou shalt carry much feed out into the
 “ field, and shalt gather but little in: for
 “ the locust shall consume it.”—“ And the
 “ Lord shall scatter thee among all people,
 “ from one end of the earth even unto the
 “ other;”—“ And among these nations shalt
 “ thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of
 “ thy foot have rest: but the Lord shall give
 “ thee there a trembling heart, and failing of
 “ eyes, and sorrow of mind. And thy life
 “ shall hang in doubt before thee: and thou
 “ shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none
 “ assurance of thy life. In the morning thou
 “ shalt say, would God it were even; and
 “ at even thou shalt say, would God it were
 “ morning; for the fear of thine heart where-
 “ with thou shalt fear, and for the sight of
 “ thine eyes which thou shalt see.” (*Deut.*
xxviii.)

“ And Cain said unto the Lord God: my
 “ crime is too great to be forgiven me. If
 “ thou dost cast me out this day from the face
 “ of the earth: I shall both be hidden from
 “ thy presence, and shall be lamenting and
 “ trembling upon the earth: and it will be,
 “ that whosoever findeth me will slay me.

In

In the first place it is manifest, that Cain understood from the words of God, that part of his punishment was to consist in banishment. For otherwise he would not have said in reply, “ If thou dost cast me out this day “ from the face of the earth.” &c.

Wherefore the being “ *curst from the ground,*” as expressed in the former passage, implied a punishment, distinct from that which proceeded from the barrenness of the soil.

God said unto him, “ καὶ νῦν ἐπικατάρατος “ σὺ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς,” and to this Cain replies, “ εἰ ἐκβάλλεις με σήμερον ἀπὸ τῆς προσώπῃ τῆς γῆς.” (See p. 36.)

I mention this lest Cain’s reply, should be thought to prove that, σαλευόμενῃ καὶ ἀκαταστατῶν was the true reading. (For Commentators have in general explained the words, which relate only to the banishment of Cain, by the subsequent declaration, that the ground should not be suffered to yield its strength.)

Cain appears to have been sensible, that his crime was too great to be forgiven him; and that mankind would always be disposed, to avenge the death of his brother.

“ My crime,” says he, “ is too great to “ be forgiven me.” My banishment will not

M

serve,

serve, to blot out the remembrance of it. “ If
 “ thou dost cast me out this day from the
 “ face of the earth ;” you will no longer be
 mindful of me ; “ I shall both be hidden
 “ from thy presence ; and shall be lamenting
 “ and trembling upon the earth ;” (for, ac-
 cording to the proverb, The wicked flee
 when no man pursueth : but the righteous
 are bold as a lion.) “ and it will be that
 “ whosoever findeth me will slay me.”

“ And the Lord God said unto him. Not
 “ so. Whosoever killeth Cain, shall endure
 “ seven-fold afflictions.”

Thus it is written in the book of Deutero-
 nomy, xxxii. 35. “ To me belongeth ven-
 “ geance, and recompence ;” and again, “ The
 “ Lord shall judge his people.” It is not the
 will of God, that we should avenge ourselves
 of our enemies, or add to the afflictions, of
 those whom he hath chastened. “ Pour out
 “ thine indignation,” says the psalmist, “ upon
 “ them, and let thy wrathful displeasure take
 “ hold of them. Let their habitation be void :
 “ and

“ and no man to dwell in their tents. For
 “ they persecute him whom thou hast smitten :
 “ and they talk how they may vex them whom
 “ thou hast wounded.” (*Psal.* lxix. 25—27.)

And in the book of the prophet Ezekiel, we read how severely God purposed to punish those nations, who took occasion to afflict the children of Israel in their distress. (*Ezekiel*, ch. xxv.)

“ And the Lord God gave a sign unto Cain,
 “ that no one who found him should slay
 “ him.”

In like manner the Lord gave to Noah the rainbow, as a sign, or token of his covenant. (*Gen.* ix. 12, 13.)

Circumcision was made the sign, or token of the covenant, which God made with Abraham. (*Gen.* xvii. 11.)

Moses was commanded to give the children of Israel a sign, that the Lord had sent him to deliver them. (*Exod.* iv. 6—9.)

God gave Gideon a sign, in confirmation of the truth of what he had said, that he

would deliver Israel by his hand. (*Judg.* vi. 36.)

“ Moreover the Lord spake again unto
 “ Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign of the Lord
 “ thy God, ask it either in the depth, or in
 “ the height above. But Ahaz said, I will
 “ not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord.”
 “ (*Isaiah* vii. 10—12.)

It is idle to inquire what the particular sign was, which God gave to Cain, for the assurance of his life. The conjectures of the Talmudists, are too ridiculous to be mentioned. A short account of their wild, and extravagant notions upon this subject, may be seen in Mr. John Gregorie's notes on certain passages in scripture, p. 69.

“ And Cain went out from the presence
 “ of God, and dwelt in the land of Naid,
 “ over against Edem.”

“ Εν γη Ναιδ,” most certainly does not signify, a vagabond in the land. Neither could Moses mean to say, that Cain had no abiding place, for it appears that he had; (*Gen.* iv. 17.)

17.) but rather that he dwelt, “ *ἐν τῇ γῇ τῆς Ναιδ*”
 “ *τρεῖς μίλις*, in the land of Naid, over against
 “ Edem.”

Admitting that Adam dwelt near the sea of Galilee, we cannot be much out in our conjectures, concerning the situation of this country.

Moses tells us that the land of Naid, was
 “ *over against Edem* ;” we may therefore expect to discover some traces of it, between the sea of Galilee, and the coasts of the Mediterranean or great sea. And accordingly just in this part of Judea we find the city of *Nain*.

“ *Ναῖν*. Urbs non longe a Capernaum,
 “ *uti videtur*. Luc. vii. 11. Eusebius ad vo-
 “ *cem Ἐνδὼρ* scribit, Endor est juxta oppidum
 “ *Ναῖμ*, in quo Christus filium viduæ suscitavit,
 “ *estque circa Scythopolin*. Idem ad vocem
 “ *Ναῖμ* scribit, eam esse in secundo miliario
 “ *a Thabor meridiem versus juxta Endor*.
 “ *Johannes Phocas autem in descriptione Pa-*
 “ *læstinæ* scribit *Naim* esse ad septentrionem
 “ *montis Tabor quasi 12 inde stadiis, et in*
 “ *orientali urbis parte esse Endor, inter Thabor*
 “ *autem et Naim et Endor fluere torrentem*
 “ *Kison*.

“ *Meminit*

“ Meminit etiam Josephus vici Ναῖν, quem
 “ Simon filius Gioræ muro cinxit. *De Bell.*
 “ *lib. v. 7.—Relandi Palæst. illust. p. 904.*

This city which Josephus writes Ναῖν, and Eusebius Ναῖμα, appears to indicate the country where Cain dwelt. For as it is similar in name, so also in point of situation, it agrees exactly with the words of Moses, who places the land of Ναῖδ, “ *over against Edem.*”

I think it probable therefore, that Cain dwelt on the other side of Mount Tabor, on the borders of the forest of Carmel, by the river Kishon; “ That ancient river, the river “ Kishon.” (*Judges v. 21.*)

Fuller speaking of Carmel says, “ From “ the top hereof we may easily discover two “ neighbouring towns *Cain* and *Caiaphas*, the “ one named from the murderer of *Abel*; the “ other from the active contriver of his death, “ *whose blood speaketh better things than that of “ Abel.* But neither appearing in scripture, “ it is enough to name them.” (*Sight of Palestine, p. 151.*) See also the maps of *Adricomius* and others.

Having said thus much concerning Cain, I am unwilling to dismiss this subject, without noticing the words of Solomon.

In

In speaking of the wicked, who cruelly persecuted the righteous, he observes that they neither knew the mysteries of God ; “ Neither
 “ hoped they for the wages of righteousness :
 “ nor discerned a reward for blameless souls.
 “ For God created man to be immortal, and
 “ made him to be an image of his own eternity.
 “ *Nevertheless through envy of the devil came*
 “ *death into the world : and they that do hold*
 “ *on his side do find it.*” (*Wisd. ii. 24.*)

Which words are commonly thought to relate, to the transgression of our first parents, (as brought about through the subtilty of the devil,) whereby “ Sin entered into the
 “ world, and death by sin.”

But surely the context abundantly justifies the supposition, that by διαβολος Solomon meant Cain, or rather those envious dispositions of mind, which prompted him to kill his brother ; contrary to the design of God, who created man to be immortal : “ and made him,” as he says in another place, “ to be an image of
 “ his own eternity.”

In proof of this, I need only transcribe the words of St. Clement, in his first epistle to the Corinthians ; who thus speaks of those
 wicked

wicked persons, who had departed from the faith ;

“ *** Harboursing unjust and foolish envy, by
 “ which also death entered into the world.
 “ For thus it is written. *And it came to*
 “ *pass, after certain days, that Cain brought*
 “ *of the fruits of the earth, an offering to God.*
 “ *And Abel he also brought of the firstlings of*
 “ *his sheep, and of their fat. And God had*
 “ *respect unto Abel, and to his gifts, but unto*
 “ *Cain and to his offerings, he had not respect.*
 “ *And it grieved Cain exceedingly, and his*
 “ *countenance fell. And the Lord said unto*
 “ *Cain. Why art thou grieved, and why is*
 “ *thy countenance fallen? If thou dost rightly*
 “ *present, but not rightly divide thine offerings,*
 “ *dost thou not sin? Be calm. His refuge will*
 “ *be unto thee, and thou shalt protect him. And*
 “ *Cain said unto Abel his brother, let us go into*
 “ *the field: and it came to pass while they*
 “ *were in the field, that Cain rose up against*
 “ *Abel his brother and slew him. Ye see*
 “ *brethren how that zeal and envy caused*
 “ *the commission of Fratricide. Through*
 “ *envy our Father Jacob fled from the face*
 “ *of his brother Esau.” &c. &c. &c.*

Perhaps

Perhaps it may be thought that these words of St. Clement, are contrary to St. Paul's assertion that, "by one man (Adam) sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." (*Rom. v. 12.*)

But the apostle must be understood to speak of that natural death, or vanity to which the creature was made subject, and from which no man, in the capacity of a moral agent, could hope to exempt himself. Whereas Solomon, and after him St. Clement, in the foregoing passages, speak only of the unnatural, or violent death of the righteous, by the hands of wicked men; contrary to the design of God, who created man to be immortal.

St. Paul, (whose object it was, to point out to the gentiles, the wisdom and goodness of God; by whom the creature was made subject to vanity, in hope of a better resurrection;) speaks only of the transgression of Adam, whereby sin entered into the world, and death by sin. St. Clement, who was solicitous to persuade the Corinthians, to walk worthy of their profession, and not to harbour unjust and foolish envy, whereby death entered

N

into

into the world; takes no notice of the transgression of our first parents, but speaks only of the death of Abel.

Of the Children of Cain.

“ And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived
“ and brought forth Enoch.”

A. M. cir. 230.

“ And he was building a settlement, and
“ he named the settlement after the name of
“ his son, Enoch.”

Having made choice of a convenient spot, he there began to form a settlement; in the mean time, his wife brought forth a son, whereupon he named the settlement, or the place of the settlement, after the name of his son, Enoch.

“ And unto Enoch was born, Gaidad.”

A. M. cir. 435.

“ And

“ And Gaidad begat, Maleleel.”

A. M. cir. 625.

“ And Maleleel begat, Mathoufala.”

A. M. cir. 795.

“ And Mathoufala begat, Lamech.”

A. M. cir. 960.

Or about thirty years after the death of Adam. The dates of their respective births, are made to correspond with those of the children of Adam, upon supposition that Enoch was born about the same time with Seth, Gaidad with Enos, and so on.

“ And Lamech took unto him two wives.
“ The name of the first was Ada; and the
“ name of the second Sella.”

This was probably at the period alluded to by Moses, (*Gen. vi. 1.*) “ when men began
“ to multiply upon the earth and daughters
“ were born unto them.” While some writers,

ters, (but with little plausibility or strength of reasoning,) have endeavoured to justify the conduct of Lamech: others with more modesty, but with no better success, have endeavoured to palliate the offence, by attributing his conduct to good motives.

A writer of this last description was P. Allix, a person of no mean fame, who says,
 “ that the polygamy of Lamech may justly
 “ be esteemed an effect of his misapprehensions
 “ concerning the sense of the first promise;
 “ those means which he conceived most likely,
 “ he made choice of, to give him a share in
 “ the fulfilling of that promise, which pointed
 “ at a son to be born. So that the irregularity
 “ he was guilty of in marrying two wives at
 “ the same time, may pass for a proof of his
 “ being persuaded not only of the promise,
 “ *That the seed of the woman should break the*
 “ *serpent's head*, but also of the creation of
 “ the world.” (*Reflec. on Gen. ch. xi.*)

But so far am I from coinciding with the learned author in these sentiments, that I cannot but regard the conduct of Lamech, as a manifest indication, that he was totally unmindful of the promise, and of the example of God, who created but one pair at the beginning

ginning and said, " for this cause shall a man
" leave his father and mother and shall cleave
" unto his wife, and *they two* shall be one
" flesh."

" And Ada brought forth Jobel."

A. M. cir. 1122.

" He was the father of those who dwell
" in tents, pasturing cattle."

Abel was the first pastor of sheep, but
Jobel " dicitur pater inhabitantium tentoria,
" quia, ut R. Solomon ait: Is primus fuit,
" qui pecudes pavit in locis desertis, et sub
" tentoriis degens, loca mutabat pro ratione
" pascuorum gregis sui, ita ut pascua in uno
" loco absumpto, in alio loco figeret taber-
" naculum suum." (*Heid. Hist. sacra.* p.
213.) See Volney's account of the Bedouns,
V. I. p. 77. &c. &c. &c.

" And his brother's name was Joubel."

Who was born perhaps, some few years
after Jobel.

He

“He it was who taught the lyre and
“harp.”

Concerning these instruments, “It is necessary to make here this general remark
“with *Euphorion* (*apud Athen.* l. XIV. ch. iv.)
“cited in Athenæus, that the stringed instruments of the antients are very often
“confounded, and do differ but very little
“from one another, except in name only.
“As they are exceeding antient, many alterations have happened to them, which has
“been the occasion of their having new
“names given them, though in the main
“they have still remained the same. Accordingly, when we find that some give them
“three strings, some seven, some ten, some
“twelve, some twenty-four, and that these
“tell us, they were plaid upon with a quill
“or bow, and those again with the fingers;
“or that some inform us, that the strings
“were stretched from the top to the bottom,
“and others, that they went cross-ways from
“one side to the other; we must not for
“this reason immediately conclude that the
“instruments are different, and that it is impossible things so unlike should be called
“by

“ by the same name. Nothing is more com-
 “ mon in things of this nature, than to call
 “ them sometimes by a general name, and
 “ at other times to express them by a particular
 “ one. Let a man examine the antient mo-
 “ numents, and he will soon see in how many
 “ different manners the lyra, or cythera of the
 “ antients is represented, and by how many
 “ different names it is stiled. We know the
 “ seventy have rendered the *Hebrew Kinnor*,
 “ by *Kynnyra*, *Cythara*, and *Psalterion*. The
 “ same instrument is called by the Greeks,
 “ *Kynnyra*, *Lyra*, *Phorminx*, *Cythera*, *Chelys*,
 “ *Pectis*, *Barbitos*. The Romans have made
 “ use of the same terms, to which they have
 “ added *Testudo*. We commonly express it
 “ in our language by *the ancient Lyre*.” *Cal-*
met's Diff. iv.

The antient *Lyre* of which we have here
 the origin, is said to have been invented by
 Mercury, who made it of a tortoise shell,
 and as such it is found among the cælestial
 signs.

Athenæus tells us (*lib.* IV. ch. xxiii.) that
 the *Nable* which the seventy translate *Psal-*
terion, was called *Sidonian*, because the *Phæ-*
nicians were supposed to be the inventors of
 it.

it. He describes it as a hollow piece of wood with cords stretched over it.

Juba (l. IV. *Hist. Theatr. apud Athen.* l. IV. ch. xxiii.) attributes the invention of it to the Phœnicians; and the prophet Ezekiel, speaks of it as a Tyrian instrument.

“ And Sella, she also brought forth Thobel.”

A. M. cir. 1122. about the time that Ada brought forth Jobel.

“ And he was a malliator, an artificer of copper and iron.”

Although it is not likely that the art of smelting ore, was known in the first ages of the world; yet when we consider that Thobel was born in the twelfth century, the passage before us will not so much excite our astonishment. And moreover as it is probable that he was considerably advanced in years, before he became a worker in copper and iron; we may venture to date the discovery of this art, so late as in the 15th or 16th century. And surely it is not so much to be wondered, that the art of working in copper

per and iron, should be found out in the course of fifteen or sixteen hundred years.

That this important discovery, was owing to the casual effect of subterraneous fires, or the burning of woods, as some writers have conjectured, appears extremely probable. For “in most
“mineral countries there are veins of metallic
“ores, which lie contiguous to the surface of
“the earth, and these having been fluxed
“whilst the woods growing over them were
“on fire, probably, suggested to many nations
“the first idea of smelting ores.” (*Watson's Chem. Lec. v. III. p. 261*). And such appear to have been the sentiments of Lucretius.

That the first idea of smelting ores was thus suggested to Thobel, I think very probable; for the descendants of Cain inhabited the coasts of Tyre, the whole of which country abounds in copper and iron ores. Moreover, Sanchoniatho in his Phœnician history, preserved by Eusebius, tells us that the descendants of Protogonus and Æon settled in Phœnicia. Hypsuranius, says he, inhabited Tyre.

*** “And when violent tempests of winds
“and rains came, the boughs in Tyre being

O

“rubbed

“ rubbed against each other, took fire, and
 “ burnt the wood there, &c.” And presently
 after he says, “ of the sons of this Hypsuranius
 “ were begotten two brothers, the inventors
 “ of iron, and of the forging thereof. One
 “ of these called *Chryſor*, whom he affirms
 “ to be *Hephæſtus* or *Vulcan*, exerciſed himſelf
 “ in words and charms, and divinations; and
 “ he found out the hook, bait, and fiſhing-
 “ line, and boats ſlightly made; and that he
 “ was the firſt of all men that ſailed. Where-
 “ fore he alſo was worſhipped after his death
 “ for a God, and they called him *Diamichius*;
 “ and ſome ſay his brothers invented the way
 “ of making walls of brick.”

Here then I think we may diſcern the
δίοσκηροι mentioned by St. Paul, (*Acts* xxviii.
 11.) the Caſtor and Pollux of the antients,
 and the Gemini of the Zodiac; which ſign, if
 our conjectures are right, denotes the two ſons
 of Lamech, Joubel and Thobel.

I am aware that Eusebius ſpeaks of the
δίοσκηροι in a ſubſequent paſſage, but as they
 are called alſo the firſt navigators, I cannot
 but think that there is ſome obſcurity or con-
 fuſion, in this fragment of the Phœnician hiſ-
 tory, (which they who are better ſkilled in
 theſe

these matters may possibly clear up,) and that the same persons are meant in both places.

The twelve signs of the Zodiac, in like manner, appear to me to be significant, of the principal events of the Antediluvian world.

Aries and *Taurus*, seem to denote the first occupations of mankind as shepherds, (*Gen.* iv. 2) and pastors of cattle. (*Gen.* iv. 20.)

Gemini, The two sons of Lamech, who are said to have been the inventors of useful arts. (*Gen.* iv. 21, 22.)

For it is principally to be observed that,
 “ the Phœnicians and the Egyptians, from
 “ whom the rest of mankind adopted the
 “ practice, called those the supreme Gods,
 “ who found out things useful in life, and
 “ had been in some sort beneficial to the com-
 “ munity. Esteeming these as benefactors,
 “ and causes of many good things, they wor-
 “ shipped them as Gods.” (*Euseb. Præp. Evang. Lib. I. ch. ix.*)

It is said to the credit of the two brothers, Castor and Pollux, that they were strongly attached to each other, and that neither of them contended for superiority over the other: a circumstance which might well be considered as commendable, because little to be

expected, in the sons of Lamech, by his *two* wives Ada and Sella.

The Egyptians did not distinguish the Gemini by name, neither are their names mentioned in the Phœnician history. The Greeks called them Διόσκουροι, and the Romans Castor and Pollux: but it is evident that they were of Phœnician origin; the reputed inventors of navigation, and on that account deemed propitious to sailors.

Cancer, is the Testudo, or Lyre of Joubel. (*Gen.* iv. 21.) answering to the “ words, “ charms, and divinations,” in which one of the two brothers before mentioned exercised himself.

Leo, serves to commemorate the destruction of wild beasts, which at that time of day, must have been a work of extreme difficulty and danger. Hercules is said to have strangled a lion, and to have worn the skin as a trophy.

Virgo, The sister of Thobel. Noema or *Astarte*. She it was who according to the fable, “ put on her head, as the mark of her “ sovereignty, a bull’s head.” (I am prone to think, says Bishop Cumberland, that the stamp on the *Sidonian* money, which *Lucian de Deâ Syriâ* assures us was a woman sitting on

on a bull, did originally signify no more than the royal power of Astarte.) “ She consecrated a star in the holy island Tyre. And the Phœnicians say, that Astarte is she, who is among the Greeks called Aphrodite.”

Hesiod in his Theogonia says, that she, whom men called *Δίκη*, (*Virgo*) withdrew from the society of mankind, when they ceased to be virtuous, and abode in the mountains. But when seditions and wars broke out among men, through their increasing iniquity, she was entirely withdrawn from them and was placed among the constellations of heaven. Thus Ovid,

“ *Victa jact pietas, et Virgo, cæde madentes*

“ *Ultima cælestium terras Astræa reliquit.*”

I need not observe how well these accounts, so far as they relate to the prevailing wickedness of the times, agree with the writings of Moses.

Libra, may denote Enoch, or according to the Phœnician history, Sydyk the just “ who invented salt.”

Scorpio, one of the sons of the Dioscuri before mentioned, “ who found out herbs, the cure of bitings, and charms.” *Sanch.* The figure is that of a man standing upon a scorpion,

scorpion, holding a serpent in each hand.
(*Eratosthenis Cyr. Catast.*)

Sagittarius. Ἐσσηκότα καὶ τοξεύοντα. And consequently not the Centaur, as some would have it. The figure therefore was not originally what it now is. (*Eratof. C. Catast.*) This sign may possibly denote, some one of those “mighty men, which were of old men of “renown.” (*Gen. vi. 4.*) The words of Sanchoniatho bear some analogy to those of Moses. “In these mens age,” viz. in the ninth and tenth generations, “there was one “Elioun, which imports in Greek Hypsistos, “the most high;—he dying in fight with “wild beasts, was consecrated, and his children offered sacrifices and libations to him.”
Sanch.

Capricornus. The figure is half a goat and half a fish; and brings to our recollection the words of the poet,

“ Et modo quæ graciles gramen carpere capellæ,
“ Nunc ibi deformes ponunt sua corpora Phocæ.”

Aquarius. He who by his almighty power,
“brought a flood of water upon the earth,
“to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath
“of life, from under heaven.” (*Gen. vi. 17.*)
“Who caused the fountains of the great deep
to

“ to be broken up, and the windows of heaven
 “ to be opened.” (*Gen. vii. 11.*)

Pisces. The figure is that of two fishes, placed nearly parallel to each other, with their heads in a contrary direction. The one was called by the Greeks βόρειος, and the other νότιος. “ ἐχῶσι δὲ σύνδεσμον ἐκ τῶ ἐμπροσθίῃ ποδὸς “ τῶ κριῶ.” (*Eratosthenis C. Catast.*)

This last of the twelve signs, (joined to Aries to denote the unity of the Zodiac,) seems to indicate the universal prevalence of the waters, by which the old world perished.

This conjectural account of the origin of the twelve signs of the Zodiac, will, I hope, induce some one to consider the subject more attentively.

The destruction of the whole world, and the miraculous preservation of Noah and his family in the ark, could not but be had in remembrance by mankind through many succeeding generations. But the Egyptians appear to have been the first, to record the traditional accounts, which were still current among men, concerning the principal events and transactions of the first ages of the world. To them therefore we may venture to attribute the invention of the Zodiac; which seems to be

be of the most remote antiquity, and to have been but ill explained by the Grecian mythologists in later ages. But upon supposition that those symbols, or hieroglyphics which we now call the signs of the Zodiac, were meant to be descriptive of the memorable events of the old world, they afford us a specimen of the wisdom of the Egyptians, in which Moses was learned. (*Acts* vii. 22.)

In such subjects had his understanding been exercised in the court of Pharaoh, and of such matters it pleased God to give him a more perfect knowledge, during his abode in the wilderness: and to ordain that the history which he compiled, should be transmitted down to us, unmixed with those fables and endless genealogies, which obscure the annals of the heathen nations.

It was not granted to the author of the Phœnician history, to satiate his thirst at that pure fountain of truth, which refreshed the camp of Israel; and to the difficulties which he met with, in procuring any thing like a consistent account of past events, from the Egyptian or Ammonean archives, we must attribute the various imperfections of his history.

Never-

Nevertheless such would have been our uncertain knowledge of the transactions of mankind, during the first ages of the world; if the book of the law, had either never been compiled, or left to perish amid the ruins of the temple!

“ And Thobel’s sister, Noema.”

Many writers are of opinion, that Moses mentioned the sister of Thobel, on account of the traditions concerning her, under some other character.

Huet affirms that Minerva is so called by Plutarch in his book *De Iside et Osiride*. But surely more attention is to be paid to the judgment of Hesiod in these matters, from whom we learn that she was venerated, on account of her singular piety, and that men called her Δίκη.

“ And Lamech said unto his wives, Ada
 “ and Sella; hear my voice ye wives of La-
 “ mech: hearken unto my words. When
 “ have I slain a man to my wounding, and
 P “ a young

“ a young man to my hurt? Wherefore
“ Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, but La-
“ mech seventy times seven.”

Lamech in opposition to the example of God, and contrary to the general practice of mankind, “ took unto him two wives;” and of such conduct, domestic unhappiness was the result.

His two wives, in all probability, were at enmity with each other, and equally dissatisfied with him: and from the purport of his speech to them, we may clearly discern, that their mutual jealousy and disputes, had given him but too much reason to be alarmed for his own personal safety.

And for this cause he thought proper to remind them, that God had threatened, to cause the person who killed Cain, to suffer seven-fold afflictions; and consequently, that he would assuredly, more severely avenge the death of him, who had neither “ slain a man
“ to his wounding, nor a young man to his
“ hurt.”

How wretched must have been the state of that house, which was thus divided against itself!
Never-

Nevertheless as some writers have attempted to justify the conduct of Lamech, and others to palliate his offence; it may not be amiss to put men in mind that, “ he which made them
 “ at the beginning, made them male and fe-
 “ male; and said, for this cause shall a man
 “ leave father and mother, and shall cleave
 “ to his wife: and they twain shall be one
 “ flesh.” (*Matt. xix. 5.*)

The example of God, enforced as it were, by the wonderful equality between the sexes, affords an unanswerable argument against polygamy; and at the same time, clearly demonstrates, that it is the will of God, that “ every
 “ man should have his own wife, and every
 “ woman her own husband;” as the apostle has given it in command. (*1 Cor. vii. 2.*)

And as the example of God is the foundation of all law; so the observance of his laws, is the only sure foundation of domestic happiness, and of national prosperity.

It may be said perhaps, that polygamy was frequent among the Jews, and that it was lawful for a man to put away his wife.

But if there was nothing injurious in the practice, nothing offensive in it, why did the God of Israel disdain the offerings of his people?

ple? Was it not because the altar of the Lord was covered with weepings and with tears? and he who hateth putting away, would not accept the offerings of one, who contrary to the dictates of nature, had dealt treacherously against the wife of his youth. (*Malachi* ii. 13—16.)

And does not a man's conscience tell him, that the law is equitable, which says, "The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife." (1 *Cor.* vii. 4.)

Who then will venture to affirm that the offence which he condemns, is less obnoxious in his own person? Imperious man! Who thinks the voice of that wisdom which formed the heavens, altogether too trivial to be attended to, in the management of his vast concerns! but as he is sensible, that he cannot much prolong his days, and enjoy the fruits of his labours; let him hear what He has said, who can give him an eternal mansion, and with it more than either he desires or deserves.

"Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves,

“ thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor
“ revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the
“ kingdom of God.” (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.)

Of the Children of Adam.

“ And Adam knew Eve his wife: and she
“ conceived and brought forth a son, and she
“ called his name Seth, saying: For God
“ has raised me up another seed, instead of
“ Abel whom Cain slew.”

“ St. Chrysostom's thought upon the text
“ is, that Eve did not only give her son *Seth*
“ this name in a grateful acknowledgement
“ of God's goodness to her; but also that
“ it might be a standing reproach upon her
“ son *Cain*, and a mark of her high displeasure
“ for the great injury he had done his mother
“ in depriving her of so good a son.” (*In Loc.*
Homil. xx. p. 196.) *Parker's Bibl. biblica.*

This son was born, as we read in the next
chapter, A. M. 230.

“ And unto Seth was born a son, and he
“ called his name Enos. He trusted that he
“ would invoke the name of the Lord God.”

We

We are told in a preceding passage, that Eve called her son's name Seth, saying: "For God hath raised me up another seed, instead of Abel, whom Cain slew." So in the passage before us, Seth is said to have called his son's name Enos, because he trusted that he would be a faithful worshipper of God.

I am not ignorant of the different interpretations which have been given of this passage. Dr. Lightfoot's I think harsh and improbable. To that of Dr. Patrick I object, because men certainly did not then first begin to call upon the name of the Lord. Neither am I disposed to admit, with the generality of commentators, that the supposed distinction, between the two families of Cain and Seth did in fact subsist.

Wherefore as the passage will bear such a construction, I am inclined to think that Moses meant only to assign the reason, why Seth called the name of his son Enos:—because "he trusted that he would invoke the name of the Lord God."

" This is the account of the origin of mankind. In the day that God made Adam, he made him in the image of God. He
" made

“ made them male and female, and blessed
“ them; and called his name Adam, in the
“ day that he made them.”

From the above passage it appears, that Adam and Eve were both created on the same day. Moses tells us, in this short abstract of the preceding history, that Adam was made in the image of God, and that he made them male and female, and blessed them; but he takes no sort of notice, of the visionary formation of the woman out of the man.

“ And Adam lived two hundred and thirty
“ years, and generated after the similitude of
“ himself, and according to his own image,
“ and called his name Seth.”

According to his own image; that is, after the image of God, in which he was made. And doubtless all men, in like manner, are born to be immortal; and certainly will be so, “ If they seek not death in the error of
“ their lives: and pull not upon themselves
“ destruction, with the works of their own
“ hands.” (*Wisd. i. 12.*)

“ And

“ And the days of Adam, which he lived
“ after he begat Seth, were eight hundred
“ years. And he begat sons and daughters.
“ And all the days which Adam lived, were
“ nine hundred and thirty years, and he died.”

“ And Seth lived two hundred and five
“ years, and begat Enos. And Seth lived
“ after he begat Enos, seven hundred and
“ seven years, and begat sons and daughters.
“ And all the days of Seth, were nine hundred
“ and twelve years, and he died.”

“ And Enos lived a hundred and ninety
“ years, and begat Cainan. And Enos lived
“ after he begat Cainan, seven hundred and
“ fifteen years, and begat sons and daughters.
“ And all the days of Enos, were nine hun-
“ dred and five years, and he died.”

“ And Cainan lived a hundred and seventy
“ years, and begat Maleleel. And Cainan
“ lived after he begat Maleleel, seven hundred
“ and forty years, and begat sons and daugh-
“ ters. And all the days of Cainan, were nine
“ hundred and ten years, and he died.

“ And Maleleel lived a hundred and fixty-
“ five years, and begat Jared. And Maleleel
“ lived after he begat Jared, seven hundred
“ and

“ and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters. And all the days of Maleleel, were eight hundred and ninety-five years, and he died.”

“ And Jared lived a hundred and sixty-two years, and begat Enoch. And Jared lived after he begat Enoch, eight hundred years, and begat sons and daughters. And all the days of Jared, were nine hundred and sixty-two years, and he died.”

“ And Enoch lived a hundred and sixty-five years, and begat Mathousala. And Enoch continued pleasing to God, after he begat Mathousala two hundred years, and begat sons and daughters. And all the days of Enoch, were three hundred and sixty-five years, and Enoch pleased God, and was not found, for God took him.”

“ By faith,” says the apostle, “ Enoch was translated, that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him; for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God. But without faith it is impossible to please him. For he that cometh to God, must believe

Q

“ that

“ that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them
 “ that diligently seek him.” (*Heb. xi. 5, 6.*)

St. Paul having asserted that “ faith, was
 “ the substance of things hoped for, the evi-
 “ dence of things not seen,” takes notice of
 Enoch’s translation, in order to shew that
 his virtuous conduct, proceeded from a well
 grounded confidence, that God was a rewarder
 of those who diligently sought him.

The author of the book of Wisdom more
 largely discourses upon this subject. “ He
 “ (*Enoch*) pleased God, and was beloved of
 “ him: so that living among sinners, he was
 “ translated. Yea, speedily was he taken
 “ away, lest that wickedness should alter his
 “ understanding, or deceit beguile his soul;
 “ for the bewitching of naughtiness doth ob-
 “ scure things that are honest: and the wan-
 “ dring of concupiscence, doth undermine the
 “ simple mind. He being made perfect in
 “ a short time, fulfilled a long time, for his
 “ soul pleased the Lord: therefore hastened he
 “ to take him away, from among the wicked.
 “ This the people saw, and understood it
 “ not: neither laid they up this in their minds,
 “ that his grace and mercy is with his saints,
 “ and

“and that he hath respect unto his chosen.”
(Wisd. iv. 10—15.)

From hence it appears that in the days of Enoch, the earth was corrupt before God, and that his translation was designed to be a strong indication to mankind, of God’s aversion to sin, and of his respect unto his chosen.

And to this agree the words of the preacher :
 “ Enoch pleased the Lord, and was translated,
 “ being an example of repentance to all ge-
 “ nerations.” *(Ecclus. xliv. 16.)*

Wherefore as the translation of Enoch was purposely designed, to be an example of repentance to that wicked generation ; and not only to them, but as the preacher says, “ to
 “ all generations ;” St. Jude thought proper to lay some stress upon so signal an instance of God’s aversion to sin, and concern for the preservation of good men.

“ And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam,
 “ prophesied of these, saying, behold, the Lord
 “ cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to
 “ execute judgment upon all, and to con-
 “ vince all that are ungodly among them,
 “ of all their ungodly deeds which they have
 “ ungodly committed, and of all their hard

“ speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken
 “ against him.” (*Jude* 14, 15.)

In the above passage, Enoch is said to have prophesied against those ungodly sinners, among whom he lived, and to have warned them of the impending judgment of God. But let us not mistake the words of the apostle.

To prophesy does not always mean explicitly to declare future events, and much less to commit the predictions concerning them to writing.

Such knowledge was sometimes conveyed to mankind, through the medium of various symbolical representations. Whatever was sufficient to awaken the attention of mankind, so as to induce them, to turn away from their wickedness, lest they should become obnoxious to the wrath of God, was a prophetic warning : and the person who by means of symbolical representations, or figurative allusions of any kind, conveyed such information to the people, was a prophet.

In proof of this I need not be careful to select instances from the writings of the prophets. Isaiah speaks of the death of the righteous, as affording a sufficient indication to the wicked of God's approaching judgments.

“ The

“ The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth
 “ it to heart; and merciful men are taken
 “ away, none considering that the righteous
 “ is taken away from the evil to come.”
 (*Isaiab* lvii. 1.)

Enoch therefore may very properly be said to have prophesied against those ungodly persons among whom he lived, and to have warned them of God's impending wrath; forasmuch as he was set forth by God, to be an example of repentance to them. “ His soul
 “ pleased the Lord: therefore hastened he to
 “ take him away, from among the wicked.
 “ This the people saw, and understood it not:
 “ neither laid they up this in their minds,
 “ that his grace and mercy is with his saints,
 “ and that he hath respect unto his chosen.”
 (*Wisd.* iv. 14, 15.)

Of the ungodly finners, Enoch prophesied, *saying*. “ Behold, the Lord cometh with ten
 “ thousands of his saints to execute judgment.”
 &c.

Enoch's translation was an example of repentance to them; and had they considered it at all, they must have understood, “ that
 “ the righteous was taken away from the evil
 “ to come;” and consequently, that unless
 they

they did repent, God would certainly take vengeance of their sins.

Wherefore Enoch by his translation spake plainly, if not more forcibly, to that wicked generation, than he would have done by saying in the spirit of prophecy, “ behold the Lord
“ will come with fire, and with his chariots,
“ like a whirlwind, to render his anger with
“ fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire.”
(*Isaiab* lxvi. 15.)

The phrase of “ coming with ten thousands
“ of his saints,” was probably taken from the words of Moses, “ And he said, the Lord
“ came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir
“ unto them; he shined forth from mount
“ Paran, and he came with ten thousands of
“ his saints: from his right hand went a
“ fiery law for them.” (*Deut.* xxxiii. 2.)

In short, the sum of Enoch’s prophecies, consisted in his own virtuous conduct, in the midst of a perverse and crooked generation, and in the manner of his subsequent departure from among them.

“ And Mathousala lived a hundred and
“ eighty-seven years, and begat Lamech. And
“ Mathou-

“ Mathoufala lived after he begat Lamech,
“ seven hundred and eighty-two years, and
“ begat fons and daughters. And all the
“ days of Mathoufala which he lived, were
“ nine hundred and fixty-nine years, and he
“ died.”

“ And Lamech lived a hundred and eighty-
“ eight years, and he begat a fon, and called
“ his name Noe; faying, This person will
“ caufe us to ceafe from our work, and from
“ the labours of our hands, and from the
“ ground which the Lord God hath curfed.”

How far this prediction concerning him was
fulfilled, will appear by the fequel.

“ And Lamech lived after he begat Noe,
“ five hundred and fixty-five years, and begat
“ fons and daughters. And all the days of
“ Lamech, were seven hundred and fifty-
“ three years, and he died.”

“ And Noe was five hundred years old,
“ and begat three fons, Sem, Cham, and
“ Japheth.”

T H E E N D.

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

A. M.

- 1 AFTER other things set in order, God made man in his own image, he made them male and female, and blessed them, and called his name Adam, in the day that he made them. (*Gen. v. 1, 2.*) And God took the man whom he formed, and placed him in the Garden of Edem, to cultivate and preserve it: and after he had caused him to receive instruction, through the influence of the prophetic spirit; he sent him forth to cultivate the ground from whence he was taken. (*Gen. ii. and iii.*) And Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and brought forth Cain, and some time after Abel. (*Gen. iv. 1, 2.*) And it came to pass, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother and slew him. Wherefore God banished Cain, and caused him to dwell in the land of Naid. (*Gen. iv. 16.*)
- 230 Adam begat a son, in his own image, and called his name Seth. (*Gen. v. 3.*) *About the same time Cain begat Enoch. And he was building a settlement, and he called the settlement after the name of his son, Enoch.*
- 435 Seth begat Enos. *Enoch the son of Cain, Gaidad.*
- 625 Enos begat Cainan. *Gaidad, Maleleel.*
- 795 Cainan begat Maleleel. *Maleleel the son of Gaidad, Mathousala.*
- 930 Adam died.
- 960 Maleleel begat Jared. *Mathousala, Lamech.*
- 1122 Jared begat Enoch. *Lamech took unto him two wives, Ada and Sella; and to him was born, about this time, Jobel, by his wife Ada, whom Moses calls,*

R

the

A. M.

the father of those who dwell in tents, pasturing cattle. And his brother's name was Joubel: who taught the lyre and harp. And Sella, she also brought forth Thobel; and he was a malliator, an artificer of copper and iron. And the sister of Thobel Noema.

- 1142 Seth died.
 1287 Enoch begat Mathousala.
 1340 Enos died.
 1474 Mathousala begat Lamech.
 1487 Enoch was translated, on account of his singular piety, and for an example of repentance, to those wicked persons among whom he lived. (*Gen. v. 24.*)
 1535 Cainan died.
 1662 Lamech begat Noe.
 1690 Maleleel died.
 1922 Jared died.
 2162 Noe was five hundred years old, and he begat three sons, Sem, Cham, and Japheth.
 2227 Lamech died.
 2256 Mathousala died.
 2262 Noe was six hundred years old; and the flood came upon the earth. (*Gen. vii. 6.*)

N. B. The above table agrees with all our *Western editions* of the Septuagint; the *Eastern copies*, place the death of Mathousala in the year of the deluge A. M. 2256. See *chronology of the Septuagint*, p. 16. The learned author's reasons for correcting our present Western editions, do not weigh with me.

RECAPITULATION.

This portion of Scripture

Contains an account of the instruction which Adam received, through the influence of the prophetic spirit, in the garden of Edem; his departure from thence; the death of Abel, and banishment of Cain; the occupations of his sons, the genealogy of mankind, &c.

CHAP.
III.
1.

BUT the serpent was the most subtle of all the beasts upon the earth, which the Lord God made. And the serpent said unto the woman;

2. Wherefore said God, eat ye not of every tree of the garden? And the woman said; we may
3. eat of the fruit of the garden, but of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God said, eat ye not of that, neither touch it lest ye die.
4. And the serpent said unto the woman; Ye will

R 2

not

5. not perish by death; for God knew, that in the day ye did eat thereof, your eyes would be opened, and ye would be as Gods, knowing good and evil.

6. And the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and beautiful to the sight; and it is honourable to obtain knowledge; and taking of the fruit thereof, she did eat, and gave also to her husband with her and he did eat.

7. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they twisted the leaves of the fig-tree, and made themselves girdles.

8. And they heard the voice of the Lord God, walking in the garden, in the cool of the day; and they hid themselves, both Adam and his wife, from the presence of the Lord God, in the midst of the garden.

9. And God called Adam, and said unto him;
10. Adam where art thou? And he said unto him; I heard the voice of you walking in the garden, and I was afraid, because I am naked, and I hid myself.

11. And God said unto him; who has told thee that thou art naked? surely of the tree, concerning which I commanded thee, of that only
12. not to eat, of that thou hast eaten. And Adam
said;

said; the woman whom thou didst join with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.

13. And God said unto the woman; why hast thou done this? And the woman said; the serpent deceived me, and I did eat.

14. And God said unto the serpent; because thou hast done this, thou art cursed from all cattle, and from all the beasts which are upon the earth. Upon thy breast and on thy belly shalt thou go, and feed on earth all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; he shall subdue thy head, and thou shalt ensnare his heel.

16. And unto the woman he said; in multiplying I will multiply thy pains and thy conception, with pangs shalt thou bring forth children: and thy refuge shall be to thy husband, and he shall protect you.

17. But unto Adam he said; because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten; of the tree concerning which I commanded thee, of that only not to eat, of that thou hast eaten; cursed is the ground in thy labours, with trouble shalt thou eat thereof all the days of thy life. Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee, and thou

19. thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread, until thou shalt return unto the earth from whence thou wast taken; for thou art earth, and shalt return to earth.

20. And Adam called his wife's name Life; as
21. the mother of all living. And the Lord God made for Adam and his wife, garments of skins, and cloathed them.

22. And God said; behold! Adam is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now let him not stretch forth his hand, and take of the tree of life, and eat and live for ever.

23. And the Lord God sent him forth, from the garden of pleasure, to cultivate the ground from whence he was taken. And he sent
24. forth Adam, and caused him to dwell before the garden of pleasure. And he placed a Cherubim with a flaming sword brandished, to keep the way of the tree of life.

A P. And Adam knew Eve his wife, and she
V. conceived and brought forth Cain, and said;
. I have obtained a man through God. And
e. again, she brought forth his brother Abel. And Abel became a pastor of sheep, but Cain cultivated the ground.

And

3. And it came to pass, after certain days,
 4. that Cain brought of the fruits of the earth,
 an offering to God. And Abel he also brought
 of the firstlings of his sheep, and of their fat.
 And God had respect unto Abel, and to his
 5. gifts, but unto Cain and to his offerings, he
 had not respect. And it grieved Cain exceed-
 ingly, and his countenance fell.

6. And the Lord said unto Cain; why art
 thou grieved, and why is thy countenance
 7. fallen? If thou dost rightly present, but not
 rightly divide thine offerings, dost thou not
 sin? Be calm. His refuge will be unto thee,
 and thou shalt protect him.

8. And Cain said unto Abel his brother, let
 us go into the field: and it came to pass while
 they were in the field, that Cain rose up against
 Abel his brother, and slew him.

9. And the Lord God, said unto Cain; where
 is Abel thy brother? And he said I know
 10. not; am I my brother's keeper? And the
 Lord said; what hast thou done? the voice
 of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from
 11. the ground. And now thou art cursed from
 the ground which hath opened its mouth,
 to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand.
 12. Wherefore thou shalt cultivate the ground,
 and

and it shall not be granted, to yield unto thee its strength. Lamenting and trembling shalt thou be upon the earth.

13. And Cain said unto the Lord God; my
 14. crime is too great to be forgiven me. If thou
 dost cast me out this day from the face of
 the earth; I shall both be hidden from thy
 presence, and shall be lamenting and trembling
 upon the earth; and it will be that whosoever
 15. findeth me will slay me. And the Lord God
 said unto him; not so. Whosoever killeth
 Cain, shall endure seven-fold afflictions.

- And the Lord God gave a sign unto Cain,
 that no one who found him should slay him.
 16. And Cain went out from the presence of God,
 and dwelt in the land of Naid, over against
 Edem.

17. And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived
 and brought forth Enoch. And he was build-
 ing a settlement, and he named the settlement
 18. after the name of his son, Enoch. And unto
 Enoch was born Gaidad. And Gaidad begat
 Maleleel. And Maleleel begat Mathousala,
 and Mathousala begat Lamech.

19. And Lamech took unto him two wives: the
 name of the first was Ada; and the name of the
 20. second Sella. And Ada brought forth Jobel.

He

21. He was the father of those who dwell in tents,
 22. pasturing cattle. And his brother's name was
 Joubel. He it was who taught the lyre and
 harp. And Sella, she also brought forth
 Thobel. And he was a malliator, a worker
 of copper and iron. And Thobel's sister,
 Noema.

23. And Lamech said unto his wives, Ada and
 Sella; hear my voice ye wives of Lamech:
 hearken unto my words. When have I slain a
 24. man to my wounding, and a young man to my
 hurt? Wherefore Cain shall be avenged seven-
 fold, but Lamech seventy times seven.

25. And Adam knew his wife; and she con-
 ceived and brought forth a son, and she called
 his name Seth, saying; For God hath raised
 me up another seed, instead of Abel whom Cain
 26. slew. And unto Seth was born a son, and he
 called his name Enos. He trusted that he
 CHAP. V. would invoke the name of the Lord God.

1. This is the account of the origin of mankind.
 In the day that God made Adam, he made him
 2. in the image of God. He made them male
 and female, and blessed them, and called his
 name Adam, in the day that he made them.

3. And Adam lived two hundred and thirty
 years, and generated after the similitude of
 S himself,

himself, and according to his own image, and
 4. called his name Seth. And the days of Adam
 which he lived after he begat Seth, were eight
 hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters.
 5. And all the days which Adam lived, were nine
 hundred and thirty years, and he died.

6. And Seth lived two hundred and five years,
 7. and begat Enos. And Seth lived after he be-
 gat Enos, seven hundred and seven years, and
 8. begat sons and daughters. And all the days of
 Seth, were nine hundred and twelve years, and
 he died.

9. And Enos lived a hundred and ninety years,
 10. and begat Cainan. And Enos lived after he
 begat Cainan, seven hundred and fifteen years,
 11. and begat sons and daughters. And all the
 days of Enos, were nine hundred and five years,
 and he died.

12. And Cainan lived a hundred and seventy
 13. years, and begat Maleleel. And Cainan lived
 after he begat Maleleel, seven hundred and forty
 14. years, and begat sons and daughters. And all
 the days of Cainan, were nine hundred and ten
 years, and he died.

15. And Maleleel lived a hundred and fixty-five
 16. years, and begat Jared. And Maleleel lived
 after he begat Jared, seven hundred and thirty
 years,

17. years, and begat sons and daughters. And all the days of Maleleel, were eight hundred and ninety-five years, and he died.

18. And Jared lived a hundred and sixty-two
19. years, and begat Enoch. And Jared lived after
20. he begat Enoch, eight hundred years, and be-
gat sons and daughters. And all the days of
Jared, were nine hundred and sixty-two years,
and he died.

21. And Enoch lived a hundred and sixty-five
22. years, and begat Mathoufala. And Enoch
continued pleasing to God, after he begat Ma-
thoufala two hundred years, and begat sons and
23. daughters. And all the days of Enoch, were
24. three hundred and sixty-five years, and Enoch
pleased God, and was not found, for God took
him.

25. And Mathoufala lived a hundred and eighty-
26. seven years, and begat Lamech. And Ma-
thoufala lived after he begat Lamech, seven
hundred and eighty-two years, and begat sons
27. and daughters. And all the days of Mathou-
fala which he lived, were nine hundred and
sixty-nine years, and he died.

28. And Lamech lived a hundred and eighty-
29. eight years, and begat a son, and called his
name Noe; saying, This person will cause us

- to cease from our work, and from the labours of our hands, and from the ground which the
30. Lord God hath cursed. And Lamech lived after he begat Noe, five hundred and sixty-five
31. years, and begat sons and daughters. And all the days of Lamech, were seven hundred and fifty-three years, and he died.
32. And Noe was five hundred years old, and he begat three sons, Sem, Cham, and Japheth.
-

Upon a review of the text, it was thought necessary to make one or two alterations. The figures in the margin, refer to the subdivision of the chapters into verses in our common Bibles.

I N D E X.

ABEL born, 62. became a keeper of sheep, 63. presents an offering to God, 64. accepted, 69. the manner in which God's approbation was signified, 71.

Ada, the wife of Lamech, 91.

Adam was alone when God told him that they were not to eat of the tree of knowledge, 2. the will of God made known unto him in a dream, 2. mistakes the cause of the prohibition, 19. eats of the tree of knowledge, 26. discerns his nakedness, 29. makes a girdle of fig leaves, 31. endeavours to avoid the presence of God, 32. interrogated by God, 33. admonished of the difficulties of life, 47. laborious work not inflicted as a punishment, 47. subject to mortality, 49. his entry into life, compared to that of our Saviour into his ministry, 50. his memory to be revered, 51. calls his wife's name Life, 52. cloathed with skins, 53. the anger of the Lord not kindled against him, 55. dismissed from the garden of Edem, 57. settles in Galilee, 59. his descendants, 111. age and death, 112.

Abab, his prophets made instrumental to his deception, 7.

Angels. The ministers of God who do his pleasure, 12. not subject to death, 12.

Aquarius, sign of, 102.

Aries, sign of, 99.

Cain born, 61. a husbandman, 63. presents an offering to God, 64. his offering rejected, 69. grieved thereby, 71. the cause of God's displeasure, 71. admonished to be calm, 73. kills his brother, 75. denies the knowledge of him, 76. cursed from

from the ground, 78. apprehensive of death, 82. God giveth him a sign that no one should kill him, 83. settles in the land of Naid, 84. begets Enoch, 90. calls the name of his settlement Enoch, 90.

Cainan, his birth, age and death, 112.

Cancer, sign of, 100.

Capricornus, sign of, 102.

Cherubim. An Angel placed before the Garden of Edem, 60. not visible to Adam, 60.

Christ. His death predicted, 38. and why, 39. the creator and redeemer of mankind, 40.

Creature. Made subject to vanity not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, 13.

Curfing, what meant thereby, 36.

Devil, possessed of no power, 11. death came by envy of the devil, what meant by that expression, 87.

Egyptians and *Phœnicians* worshipped those persons who had been beneficial to the community, 99. invented the Zodiac, 103.

Enoch, the son of Cain, when born, 90.

Enoch, when born, 113. concerning his prophecy as mentioned by St. Jude, 116. translation, 117.

Enos, when born, 109. the meaning of his name, 110. age and death, 112.

Eve. The will of God not made known unto her, through the influence of the prophetic spirit, 3. but by her husband, 3. her suggestions thereupon, 3. the subsequent vision founded upon those suggestions, 5. eats of the tree of knowledge, 26. her conduct influenced by the desire of obtaining knowledge, 27. discerns her nakedness, 29. makes a girdle of fig leaves, 31. endeavours to avoid the presence of God, 32. interrogated by God, 35. the pains of child birth, not inflicted as a punishment, 41. enjoined to seek the protection of her husband, 43. called by Adam Life, 52. cloathed with skins, 53. the
anger

anger of the Lord not kindled against her, 55. dismissed from the garden of Edem, 57. brings forth Cain, 61. and Abel, 62. Seth, &c. 109.

Eusebius, quoted, 99.

Fornication, equally base in both sexes, 108.

Gaidad, when born, 91.

Gemini, sign of, 99.

God, directs Adam to abstain from the tree of knowledge, 2. is sometimes said to deceive wicked persons to their destruction, 6. again, 8. hardens Pharaoh's heart, 8. the only source of power, 9. requires us to examine into the grounds of his conduct, 28. interrogates our first parents, 33. promises the redemption of mankind, 38. why effected by the death of Christ, 39. admonishes our first parents of the future difficulties of life, 40, and 46. placed Adam in the garden of Edem, as in the case of our Saviour, for the purpose of preparatory admonition, 50. introduces Adam upon the stage of life, 52. cloathes Adam and Eve, 53. sends them forth from the garden of Edem, 57. forbids his return, 60. accepts the offerings of Abel, but rejects those of Cain, 69. and why, 71. punishes Cain, 78. gives a signal instance of his aversion to sin, and of his regard for good men, in the translation of Enoch, 117.

Jared, his birth, age and death, 113.

Jobel, when born, 93. his occupation, 93.

Joubel, when born, 93. his occupation, 94.

Knowledge of good and evil, the expression not applicable to God, 24. but merely to subordinate creatures, 24. the attainment of it honourable to man, 27.

Lamech,

Lamech, the son of *Mathousala*, when born, 91. his conduct not justifiable, 92. the purport of his speech to his two wives, 106.

Lamech, when born, 118. called his son's name *Noe*, 119. age and death, 119.

Leo, sign of, 100.

Libra, sign of, 101.

Lyre, by whom invented, 94. the different names by which it has been distinguished, 95. a Phœnician instrument, 96. ancient form, 100.

Magicians. Not possessed of power to alter the settled course of nature, 8. made instrumental to the deception of *Pharaoh*, 8.

Maleleel, the son of *Gaidad*, when born, 91.

Maleleel, his birth, age, and death, 112.

Mathousala, when born, 91.

Naid. Land of, where situated, 85.

Noe, when born, 119. his sons, 119.

Noema. The sister of *Thobel*, 100, 105.

Ores, the art of smelting them how first suggested, 97.

Phœnician history, quoted, 97, again, 98. the Phœnicians worshipped those persons who had been beneficial to society, 99.

Pharaoh, in what manner his heart was hardened, 8.

Pisces, sign of, 102.

Polygamy, contrary to nature, 107. destructive to society, 108.

Prophets. Not deceived by *Satan*, 6.

Sacrifices, their origin, 67.

Sagittarius, sign of, 101.

Sign, what meant by giving a sign, 83.

St. Chrysostom, quoted, 109.

St.

St. Clement. His epistle to the Corinthians quoted, 88. his words compared with those of St. Paul, 89.

St. Paul. The purport of his epistle to the Romans, 13. his language compared with that of St. Clement, 89.

Sanchoiatho, his Phœnician history, 104. whence compiled, 104.

Satan. Not an agent in the deception of Eve, 6. the scriptures very exprefs in excluding the agency of Satan, 6. not an apostate Angel, 12.

Scorpio, sign of, 101.

Scripture, obscured by giving real existence and efficacious power to Satan, 13.

Sella, the wife of Lamech, 91.

Serpent. A lively emblem of subtilty, 5. why chosen to be the visionary medium of imparting delusive council to the mind of Eve, 5. his declarations not directly repugnant to the words of God, 20. opposed only to the mistaken notions of the woman, 21. not false, 21. the prostrate state of his body, figuratively represented as the result of his duplicity, 36. his form not changed from what it was, 37. his overthrow predicted, 38. the wicked the seed of the serpent, 39.

Seth, when born, 109. why so called, 109.

Taurus, sign of, 99.

Thobel, when born, 96. his occupation, 96.

Tree of knowledge. Our first parents admonished to abstain from it, 18. the pernicious quality of the fruit thereof, erroneously considered by them as the cause of the prohibition, 20.

Virgo, sign of, 100.

Zodiac. The twelve signs thereof significant of the principal events of the Antediluvian world, 99. the invention of it, 103.



1371

6. Chapter. The title to the Constitution proved, 28. his
wards compared with those of St. Paul, 29.
7. Paul. The purpose of his epistle to the Romans, 1. his
language compared with that of St. Clement, 20.

8. Chapter. The Paulician history, 104. whence supplied,
104.
9. Chapter. Not an agent in the deception of Eve, 6. the language
very explicit in excluding the agency of Satan, 6. not an
angel, 104. 104.
10. Chapter. Not an agent in the deception of Eve, 6. the language
very explicit in excluding the agency of Satan, 6. not an
angel, 104. 104.

11. Chapter. The wife of Adam, 61.
12. Chapter. A lively emblem of rebellion, 61. why chosen to be the
tribune master of iniquity, 61. five reasons to the mind
of Eve, 61. his distinction not directly apparent to the
words of God, 61. opposed only to the mistaken notion of
the woman, 61. not the, 61. the promise made of his seed,
61. negatively represented as the seed of his daughter, 61. his
seed not changed from what it was, 61. his overthrow pre-
dicted, 61. the seed of the serpent, 61.

13. Chapter. When born, 104. why so called, 104.
14. Chapter. When born, 104. his occupation, 104.
15. Chapter. Our first parents admitted to abstinence from
the forbidden fruit, 104. the permission granted of the fruit thereof, especially
considered by them as the cause of the prohibition, 104.

16. Chapter. The title of the Constitution of the principal
of the American world, 104. the invention of it,
104.

4
4
4
4
4

